



**FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE**

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

### ***Political Affairs***

DISSEMINATION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

**Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy**

REPRODUCED BY  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

19980812 134

10  
98  
A05

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-002

### CONTENTS

14 JANUARY 1988

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Leningrad Gorkom, Raykom Chiefs on 1987 Plan Fulfillment [ <i>LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA</i> , 21 Oct 87]	1
Moscow Gorkom Discusses Peoples Control Committees [MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 Oct 87]	2
Bashkir Obkom Chief Responds to Criticism [R. Khabibullin; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 10 Oct 87]	3

#### MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Crimean Tatar 'Extremist' Links With USA Criticized [PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 14 Oct 87]	4
Effectiveness of Bilik Society Propaganda Questioned	8
Azeri Publishers Receive Pushtu Contract	9
Afghan Veterans Feted in Nasimi Rayon	9
Radio Baku 'Southern Azerbaijan' Desk Highlighted	9

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Comprehensive Lenin Film Documentary Debuts; Some Archives Closed [Natalya Izyumova; MOSCOW NEWS, 8-15 Nov 87]	10
Seminar Examines Individual, Personality Factors in CPSU History [V.G. Veryaskin, VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS, No 9, Sep 87]	11
Academician Tikhvinskiy on Historiography Under Perestroika [M.F. Zubkov; NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA, No 4, Jul-Aug 87]	16
Centenary of Musavat Diplomat, Writer Marked	23
Lost Works of Chamanzaminli Noted	23
Study, Rehabilitation of Azeri Cultural Figures Urged	23

#### RELIGION

Weak Propaganda Promotes Rise in Tajik Religious Activity [R. Abdullayev, N. Yodgori, B. Mingiyorov; TOJIKISTONI SOVETI, 17 Jul 87]	24
Afghan Muslim Affairs Minister Visits Baku	25
Religious Traditions Survive in Schools	25

#### CULTURE

PRAVDA Reviews Film on Controversial Director Yefremov [K. Shcherbakov; Pravda, 30 Sep 87]	26
Documentary Film Breaking Away from Bureaucratic Mold [V. Kuzin; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 11 Oct 87]	27
Moldavian Movie Industry Slow to Reform [Ye. Sobor; SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA, 23 Oct 87]	30
Conflicts of Leningrad Cultural Preservation Groups Deplored [I. Soboleva; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 Oct 87]	32
Uzbek Writer Questions Conventional View on Past 'Tyrants' [O. Oskotskiy; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 25 Sep 87]	36
Uzbek Writers' Union Elects New Chairman from 3 Candidates [V. Sokolov, V. Tyurikov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 7 Oct 87]	38
Afghan-Soviet Literary Relations Strengthened	38
Restoration of Historical Building Criticized	38
Azerbaijanfilm Chief Stresses Modern Themes	39
'Creative Ethic' in Theater Stressed	39
Critic Complains About Stereotypes in Prose	39
Iranian Azeri Poem on 'Fatherland' Published	39
Short Life of Iranian Azeri Poet Featured	39
Tvardovskiy's Need to Write Poem on Stalin Discussed [Yu. Burtin; OKTYABR, No 8, Aug 87]	39

## SOCIAL ISSUES

Justice Ministry Answers PRAVDA Article on Training for Judges .....	52
Tivodar Article [I. Tivodar; PRAVDA, 10 Jun 87] .....	52
Justice Ministry's Response [PRAVDA, 3 Oct 87] .....	53
Merits of Paid Versus Free Health Care Debated [Yevgeniya Albats; MOSCOW NEWS, 8-15 Nov 87] .....	55
Need for Protection of Uzbek Children's Health Noted [Andrei Pralnikov; MOSCOW NEWS, 6-13 Sep 87] .....	56
Extremist Crimean Tatars Criticized, Positive Changes Marked [MOSCOW NEWS, 25 Oct-1 Nov 87] .....	59
Journalist Views Changing Role of Soviet Family [T. Afanasyeva; OGONEK, No 37, Sep 87] .....	60
Aspects of Prostitution in Georgia Examined [Manana Kartoziya and Tamaz Cheishvili; AKHALGAZRDA KOMUNISTI, 16 June 87] .....	64
LiSSR Sociologists Question Students on Politics, Religion [V. Lazutka interview; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 23 Sep 87] .....	68
Lithuanian Language Classes to be Broadcast on TV [A. Masaytis; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 7 Oct 87] .....	69
Birth Control Advocated in Tajikistan [TOJIKISTON SOVETI; 29 Jul 87] .....	69
Problems Training Skilled Workers in Tajikistan [Sh. Sultonov; KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON, Jul 87] .....	71
Former Policemen Stage Moscow Armed Robbery .....	72
Rostov Komsomol Discusses Youth Crime, Gang Fighting .....	72
Soviet-American Press Conference on Alcoholism Held [IZVESTIYA, 17 Sep 87] .....	72
School Reform Efforts Assailed .....	72
Lack of Computers in Schools Criticized .....	72
Level of Legal Services To Be Improved .....	73
'Formalism' Among Teachers Assailed .....	73
Improvements in Foreign Language Teaching Proposed .....	73

## REGIONAL ISSUES

Restructuring, Acceleration Progress in Belorussia Discussed [Ye. Sokolov; PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN, No 20, Oct 87] .....	74
Moscow News Describes Latvian Demonstration of November 18 [MOSCOW NEWS, No 48, 6-13 Dec 87] .....	79
LaSSR Buro Judges Action of Western Media 'Provocative' [CINA, 13 Nov 87] .....	81
Riga City Officials Preparing for Demonstration [CINA, 18 Nov 87] .....	82
Fedoseyev on Soviet, Hungarian Social Science Cooperation [P.N. Fedoseyev interview; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 3 Oct 87] .....	82
Soviet, Hungarian Social Scientists Discuss 1956 Uprising [F. Mucsi interview; BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY, 4 Oct 87] .....	84
Kazakh Trade Union Secretary Interviewed [G.T. Chubov interview; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 8 Oct 87] .....	86
Moldavian Academician Rebutts Charges on Environmental Issues [A. Zhuchenko; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 43, 21 Oct 87] .....	88
More Efficient Mining Urged in Tajikistan [Kh. Muhabbatov, Sh. Ghafforov; KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON, Jul 87] .....	92
Development of Tajikistan's Mountainous Areas Analyzed [U. Kletselman; KOMMUNIST TOJIKISTON, Jul 87] .....	93
Water Pollution in Tajikistan [Nasrullo Asadulloyev; ADABIYOT VA SAN'AT, 16 Jul 87] .....	93
Sumgait Population Growth Outpaces Housing .....	94
Bureaucratic Overlaps Impede Nature Preservation .....	94

**Leningrad Gorkom, Raykom Chiefs on 1987 Plan Fulfillment**

*18000021a Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 21 Oct 87p 1*

[LenTASS report: "A Conference in Smolnyy"]

[Text] On 19 October the Oblast CPSU Committee convened a conference of the first secretaries of the gorkoms and raykoms of Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast. The conference examined the results of the work of the Leningrad national economic complex for the first nine months of the year and the tasks for successful fulfillment of the plan and socialist obligations for 1987.

It was noted that on the whole Leningrad's economy is at par with the tasks assigned in the five-year plan and surpasses that level for a number of indicators. In the course of introducing new management methods, implementing the Intensification-90 Program, and placing enterprises on multi-shift operations, introducing the achievements of scientific-technical progress and renovation of the active part of fixed capital have proceeded at a more rapid rate, and the effectiveness of their use has increased.

Production volume of animal husbandry is up; transportation organizations have begun to operate more stably; and tasks set for introducing housing, children's pre-school institutions, schools, polyclinics and hospitals are being overfulfilled.

At the same time, it was pointed out at the conference that according to the nine-month results, a tense economic situation has taken shape in a number of the region's industrial branches, and a trend has been noted for reducing the accumulated surplus and for lowering the development growth rate to the level achieved in 1986.

This is primarily associated with serious lags in the work of the machine-building industry, where the growth rates for production volume have slowed significantly, and lag behind the rates assigned in the five-year plan. Among the machine-building enterprises which have been switched to full profit-and-loss accounting and autonomous financing, this indicator amounted to 100.6 percent of last year's level, and the plan for deliveries has been 95.3 percent fulfilled.

Due to unfavorable weather conditions, the tasks for procurement of potatoes and vegetables were not fulfilled.

Serious problems exist in ensuring qualitative indicators for the intensification of Leningrad's economy. In industry, efforts to economize on material and fuel-energy resources have declined, and the number of enterprises guilty of overexpenditure in terms of production costs is slow to decline. Ten of the rayons of Leningrad and all of

the oblast's industry have failed to fulfill the principal indicator which characterizes the level of economic activity of the enterprises—fulfilling the profit plan.

Production costs are up on oblast farms for grain, potatoes, vegetables, milk and meat.

It was emphasized that all of this is the result of poor economic work by the administrators of a number of enterprises and organizations, and relaxation of control over this most important sector of economic activity on the part of city and rayon CPSU committees. This also applies fully to ensuring the fulfillment of the plan for product sales, as well as delivery.

Party gorkoms and raykoms must pay strict attention to eliminating the lags which have occurred in a number of branches of the national economy. The task here is as specific as can be—to ensure unconditional fulfillment of planned tasks for the year for growth rates in production volume, deliveries, and quality.

Now it is important to lose no time in thoroughly working out the plan for the coming year, and for timely conclusion of contracts for the manufacture and delivery of products. Strict control over this work by party committees is a must; the success of the economic activities of the enterprises depends on it in the most direct way, for starting on January 1 of the coming year they will switch to the new management system. The intensive nature of the planned tasks for the forthcoming period with respect to economizing on fuel-energy and material resources must be brought to the attention of every labor collective.

It was pointed out that the problem of the economy today must be solved on a qualitatively new basis—by means of introducing progressive technologies, raising the technical level of products and increasing their sales appeal, developing retail trade, and eliminating all abnormal stocks.

Party raykoms and gorkoms must actively engage in solving problems of improving the management structure and increasing the national economic yield of scientific-research and design organizations. At the present stage of formulating the thematic plans, the party must take an active part in evaluating the effectiveness of their work, and in reorienting thematic plans toward specific production requirements.

Assuring a state of balance in the financial plan, further acceleration of the development of consumer goods production and the services sphere, and fulfilling the social program—are important tasks.

It was stressed that in accordance with the requirements of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the search for ways to increase the effectiveness of party



leadership of the economy at the stage of its fundamental restructuring must become the pivotal point of the organizational and political activity of the party gorkoms and raykoms.

Also examined at the conference were certain questions of improving work with the cadres of party, soviet and economic organs under conditions of perestroyka, democratization and glasnost in social and production life, expanding the rights of the working collectives, and introducing the fundamentals of self-management to them.

Leningrad CPSU Obkom Secretary A.M. Fateyev spoke at the conference.

Taking part in the work of the conference were members of the buro of the Oblast CPSU Committee, the secretaries of the Leningrad party gorkom, responsible party and soviet officials, and the administrators of territorial economic departments.

9006

#### **Moscow Gorkom Discusses Peoples Control Committees**

*18000021b Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 87 p 1*

[Unattributed report: "In the Moscow CPSU Gorkom"]

[Text] At the regular meeting of the Moscow city party committee held on 14 October, the buro examined the question of the course of the restructuring of the activities of the people's control authorities of the city of Moscow.

It was noted that certain positive achievements had taken place in the work of the city's People's Control Committees after its leadership had been strengthened. At the same time fundamental improvements in their activities have not come to pass. The attention of the people's controllers has not been concentrated on the most important sectors of economic and social life. The necessary measures have not been taken to implement the resolution of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum on creating a uniform, integrated system of control based on the people's control organs.

Serious shortcomings were noted in the style of activity of city and rayon people's control committees. Business lurches along by inertia; no initiative is shown; their work lacks scope; practically no new forms of work have appeared. Poor use is made of glasnost in increasing the effectiveness of control. And the level of knowledge of economics of the committee workers does not meet contemporary requirements.

It was stressed that the slow pace of the restructuring of the work of the people's control organs is the result of serious neglect in supervision on the part of the city and rayon party committees and primary party organizations.

The buro has obligated the Moscow City People's Control Committee to take measures to eliminate the noted shortcomings. Departments of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom have been directed to place increased party pressure on the activities of the people's control organs, and to render them the necessary assistance in restructuring their work.

The buro examined the question of the work practices of the Qvant Scientific-Production Association [SPA] of the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry with respect to the organization for transition of the scientific-production association to full profit-and-loss accounting and autonomous financing. The staff of the association is making active preparations for transition to the new economic management methods. They have worked out the principles of the economic mechanism of the SPA, which is to function as a unified complex within the framework of the two-section management structure of the branch. The planning system envisages using for the first time estimates which reflect the overall activity of the scientific and production collectives. In connection with this the "commodity production" indicator is given new content, which permits general characterization of the results of completed scientific-research and scientific design work, as well as the manufacturing of experimental and serial production.

The principal source of scientific-technical and social development and material incentive for the collective, as established by the decree of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers, "On the Transition of Scientific Organizations to Full Profit-and-Loss Accounting and Autonomous Financing," is—profit. An enterprise switches to special-purpose financing of specific topics in accordance with contracts with the clients. This experience is especially valuable when many party and economic administrators of scientific-production associations and scientific organizations in the city passively await additional orders and instructions from higher authorities.

The economic administrators and the party and social organizations of the Kvant SPA have displayed innovativeness as well as the desire and the ability to operate in a new manner; and they have taken a creative approach to the development and assimilation of a modern economic management mechanism. A significant number of specialists from both the association and various institutions and departments have been recruited for active participation, and a number of variations of organizational structure have been prepared and examined. Methodological principles of an economic-organizational character have been drawn up, and the necessary implementing documents have been formulated.

For the purposes of stimulating new economic thinking, the content of the united political days, open letter days, and youth encounter days has been enhanced under the leadership of the party organization; sociological public opinion surveys are being taken; and round-table discussions between the leaders of subdivisions and representatives of the public are being held. Purposeful progress has been made by the party-economic aktiv in open party meetings, and in conferences of the secretaries of party, trade union and Komsomol organizations.

The buro approves and supports the practical work of the collective of the Kvant SPA, and its nontraditional approaches to the organization of this totally new matter—the transition to total profit-and-loss accounting.

Party raykoms and party committees of scientific organizations and scientific-production associations are directed to take urgent measures for mobilizing the efforts of communists and all the workers to the most expeditious assimilation of the new work methods, as the decisive condition for establishing at the scientific and production collectives an atmosphere of creativity; for improving the practical yield of the labor of the scientists, designers, engineers and workers; and for stable social development.

In consideration of the extremely compressed schedule, it was proposed to devote special attention to improving the success rate of the economic training of various categories of workers. It has been deemed expedient to establish at the facilities of the Kvant SPA, the Moscow Financial Institute, and other interested organizations, a city scientific-methodological center for the study of economic methods of management, and for accumulating and dissemination of progressive experience in scientific organizations.

The Buro of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU also examined the rate of delivery and storage of potatoes and vegetables as well as certain other questions.

9006

**Bashkir Obkom Chief Responds to Criticism**  
*18000021c Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 87 p 1*

[Article by R. Khabibullin, first secretary, Bashkir CPSU Obkom, under the rubric, "Response to Criticism": "Fencing at Shampurs"]

[Text] The Bashkir CPSU Obkom reports that the article, "Fencing at Shampurs," published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 June 1987 was examined on 18 August at a plenum of the Mechetlinskiy CPSU Raykom, and was judged to be correct.

For the errors committed in violation of the principles of party leadership and the norms of party life; for interference in the activity of the law enforcement authorities; and for misuse of his official position, CPSU Raykom First Secretary Comrade V.A. Giniyatullin was given a reprimand, and an entry was made in his official record.

For displaying lack of principle; for serious shortcomings in his work; and for passivity in solving social problems in rayon development, Raysoviet Ispolkom Chairman Comrade N.S. Amirov was given a reprimand with an entry in his official record, and at the session held on 11 September was relieved of the position he had held.

For serious shortcomings in his work, Comrade Ya.M. Mufazalov was removed from the buro membership and relieved of his duties as chief of the organizational department of the CPSU raykom.

The plenum has obliged the buro of the CPSU raykom to implement concrete measures for restructuring the style and methods of organizational and political work; for asserting Leninist principles of leaderships and norms of party life in the activities of the rayon party organization; for expansion and deepening of democracy, development of glasnost, criticism and self-criticism; and for improving work with the cadres and increasing their responsibility for matters entrusted to them.

The practical activity of the apparat of the party raykom and its first secretary for implementing the resolutions of the plenum have been placed under the control of the CPSU obkom.

In connection with the 27 August publication of the article "What the Fencing at Shampur Accomplished," Comrade V.I. Giniyatullin will report to the CPSU obkom in the first quarter of 1988 on the work undertaken to eliminate the shortcomings noted and to improve the moral-psychological climate in the rayon.

9006

### Crimean Tatar 'Extremist' Links With USA Criticized

18300016a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian  
14 Oct 87 p 4

[Unsigned article reprinted from SOVETSKAYA KUBAN of 6 October 1987: "Where Is the Blind Guide Leading?: Crimean Tatar Extremists Stage a Provocation"]

[Text] Over the past few days in the areas with the densest Crimean Tatar populations — Temryuk, Novorossiysk, Abinsk and Anapa — individuals with extremist inclinations have been carrying out agitation work among their countrymen to promote the undertaking of a mass action: a "march-campaign" from Taman to the Crimea. The very date around which plans are being laid — 7 October, Soviet Constitution Day — indicates the provocative nature of the planned actions. Yes, it is precisely on that day that Crimean Tatar extremists intend to organize a rally and demonstration in the town of Taman, from where they then plan to begin their "march on the Crimea."

Readers, try to imagine this sight: a column of people suddenly appears amid the dense flow of traffic on the highway (there is no other route). How many of them would there be? A hundred? Two hundred? A thousand? We will not speculate. In any event that crowd would be a disorganized, physically unprepared crowd (planning to walk are not only young people, but also women, old people and children), a poorly led crowd...

Of course, the problem is not traffic snarls on the highway (although they could create a hazardous situation). The problem is the people themselves. Who are they? People without rights, homes or employment? No, each one of them has — either in Taman or Krymsk, in Gelendzhik or Abinsk — a house, a family and a job; they have all their rights, but they also have their civic duty to society. Who is chasing them out onto the road on these cold October days? No one is. Around them life proceeds in its accustomed fashion: enterprises are operating at full speed, farms are hurrying to bring their harvests in on time, requiring, incidentally, extra laborers; lessons are under way in schools. Yet these people, leaving their jobs, studies and homes, as if excluding themselves from real life and the real obligations which go with it, are in motion. In motion to where? And why?

In order to understand this, we must once again give a brief reply to a basic question which has already been written about repeatedly in the press.

The restructuring begun by the party, the process of democratization of our public life and of the creation of an atmosphere of glasnost in our country have made possible a situation in which the most acute and painful issues are not concealed, but are instead discussed openly and frankly.

Among those issues was one put on the agenda by petitions from citizens belonging to the Crimean Tatar people.

As is well known, in the spring of this year they began to submit more and more frequent appeals to party and soviet organs, requesting reconsideration of legislative acts pertaining to the dissolution of the Crimean ASSR and asking for the restoration of that autonomous republic. In order to review the entire complex of issues involved, a state commission was formed under the direction of A. A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. The local situation and the sentiments and wishes of the Crimean Tatar population are being studied by a specially established study group under the aforementioned state commission. The members of this group visited Krasnodarskiy Kray from 29 July to 5 August, as well as on 6-11 September. They met with Crimean Tatar representatives in Novorossiysk, Krymsk, Abinsk, Tuapse, Temryuk and other places where there is a high density of Crimean Tatar population. They talked with workers, kolkhoz members, party, war and labor veterans, members of the intelligentsia, and young people. All the opinions and suggestions expressed during the course of these meetings were relayed to the state commission.

Specifically, the suggestion was made that Crimean Tatars take part in the study group's meetings in Moscow. That suggestion was approved. On 22 August there was a meeting of the state commission's study group at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in Moscow, and representatives of the Crimean Tatars were invited to that meeting. Participants from Krasnodarskiy Kray were R. I. Kurtiyev of Novorossiysk and R. D. Dzhemadinova of Tuapse.

As we see, the issues raised by the Crimean Tatars are being studied and considered on a high level by the state, studied attentively and enthusiastically. As has already been noted in official reports, a certain period of time will be required before the commission can draw up specific proposals. Also emphasized was the fact that any attempts to pressure the organs of state authority can merely make those organs' task more difficult. Therefore a situation of calm should be created surrounding this issue.

It would seem that everything is extremely clear.

Nevertheless certain individuals among the Crimean Tatars immediately came forward who were not content to wait calmly. Firstly, they were unhappy because calm waiting does allow them to stand out or make proclamations. The so-called "leaders" of the Crimean Tatars are not, as a rule, notable for their lofty civic and moral qualities. Having been unable to achieve any notable successes in their personal lives, and unwilling to work hard, they nevertheless lay claim to a special place in society and special authority among their fellow citizens. Riding the current wave of events, some representatives

of the Crimean Tatar people, though by no means the most worthy representatives, have managed to usurp leadership and acquire the aura of "struggling for national interests." Furthermore, while advancing demands for an immediate, instantaneous resolution of this issue, they also stop at no methods, even extreme ones. It is for this reason that they are called extremists.

There were the unfortunate events of this past July, when Crimean Tatars assembled in Moscow committed overt violations of public order and the Moscow city soviet ispolkom was forced to grant law enforcement organs supplementary powers to establish order in the capital. The most aggressive "activists" were expelled from Moscow.

They did not settle down when they returned home, either. They began to organize meetings in the cities and towns of our kray, agitating among their fellow Crimean Tatars and attempting to force them to become active participants in demonstrations in defense of their "national interests."

...The Abinskiy CPSU Raykom received a letter (bearing 215 signatures) in defense of the "fully empowered representatives of the Crimean Tatars" who journeyed to Moscow in July and, as this message phrased it, "were traveling on a matter of urgency."

What does the letter say? "We will regard their expulsion from the ranks of the CPSU, other repressive actions toward them and hindrance of their participation in the national movement to return to their ethnic homeland as anti-humanitarian and anti-democratic."

The Abinskiy Rayon newspaper *Voskhod* explained the true state of affairs to its readers in an article entitled "*Looking the Truth in the Eye*."

"What sort of repressions are alleged? Let us consider this together," write the authors, rayon procurator N. Lyashov and journalist V. Belyy. "No Crimean Tatar communist has been expelled from the party. Several of them have been fired from their jobs, that is true. But on what grounds was this done?"

There follow specific examples. Electrical installer A. Ramazanov from the Kolkhoz imeni 22nd Party Congress was absent from his job 15 days in August. The council of the installation shop decided to request that the board expel him from the kolkhoz on account of absenteeism. However, taking into consideration the ethnic sentiments of A. Ramazanov, who had gone to Moscow, the board decided not to expel him, but to send him instead to do various jobs in a different brigade. A. Ramazanov himself did not show up at the board meeting, and he did not come to work any more after that time. Only after that was it decided at a second hearing to expel him from the kolkhoz.

A total of 30 persons traveled to Moscow from Abinsk. The majority of them deserved to be fired for violation of labor legislation. Each case was considered carefully and, quite frankly, in a humanitarian manner. Labor collectives deemed it possible to allow many of the absent workers to keep their jobs. Among these were Z. Ventsova, a salesperson at the Workers Supply Department [ORS], firemen A. Osmanov and N. Netullayev, and others. Four persons were fired, including one who was let go at his own request.

Once again we would ask: where is there "repression" here? Should we not be asking a different questions here — questions about this overly sympathetic attitude toward workers absent from their jobs? Our labor legislation is one and the same for all workers, regardless of their ethnic background. The creation of any especially "lenient" conditions for the evaluation of discipline among members of the Crimean Tatar ethnic group is completely unjustified.

However, let us turn our attention once again to the letter to the Abinskiy CPSU Raykom, a letter, as we have already stated, bearing 215 signatures. Even upon cursory examination it is clear that in fact it was signed by a far smaller number of people, since a single hand signed for six Mamutovs, six Asanovs, five Osmanovs, etc.

People will say, do we need to dwell on such a petty detail? Yes, we do, because what is happening is that the sentiments of a handful of individuals are being passed off as the sentiments and hopes of the entire Crimean Tatar people. Judge for yourself: the people are being told of the horrors of alleged mass illegal firings, but upon investigation it turns out that only three people were fired, and with legal justification. On the other hand, official organs are presented with a petition bearing hundreds of signatures, and upon inspection the majority of them prove to be fictitious. Thus is created the myth of a mass "national movement" and of a lack of justice on the part of the authorities.

We have before us one other "document." It was handed to A. I. Seleznev, head of the state commission's study group, at a meeting with Crimean Tatar representatives at the krayispolkom on 4 August of this year. We will quote only two points in this so-called "Proclamation By the Crimean Tatar People":

"...A considerable portion of the present-day population of the Crimea was recruited to settle there. In this connection it would seem realistic to allow the settlers to return to their native areas. A massive re-recruitment of population from the Crimea to settle in regions requiring an influx of labor resources should be organized. Of course, this will require the conducting of the appropriate explanatory work..."

"...In the cities and villages of the Crimea there remain to this day approximately 30,000 houses belonging to Crimean Tatar working people, and which were seized upon their expulsion. In those cases in which the true owners of the houses and their legitimate heirs state a desire to reestablish their right to the housing belonging to them this matter should be resolved positively, by offering the present residents a home of equal value in exchange."

That is the program. Do you see how simple it is? We resettle the current residents of the Crimea somewhere far away, finding them living space of equal value in other areas, and taking their houses away from them... In short, we "restore justice" in favor of the Crimean Tatars by committing an act of injustice toward the people of various nationalities who have lived in the Crimea for more than 40 years. True, some Crimean Tatar leaders were quick to distance themselves from this "document," declaring that it supposedly was never discussed or adopted by anyone. Nevertheless, there it is, typed and having obviously passed through many hands, officially presented to an official individual.

The closer we approach the anniversary of the Great October Revolution, the more aggressive become the extremist leaders, and the more actively they launch their unsavory actions. Travelers scurry about from one rayon to the next, organizing meetings in the courtyards and apartments of Crimean Tatars, urging them to take action. Once again the collection of money from Crimean Tatar families for "future delegates to Moscow" has begun. In Abinsk such collection has been handled by D. Mukhterem, in Tuapse by M. Voyennyy, and in Taman by A. Yagayev and I. Sadykov.

Aggressiveness has also been demonstrated with regard to local organs. In Abinsk a representative of the local authorities came to one of the Crimean Tatar meetings. He was literally prevented from taking a seat at the table and was asked to leave. What sort of authority would the leaders of this "movement" be willing to accept, if they do not trust their own, local authorities?

The traces of incitement extend to Uzbekistan, to the place where Mustafa Dzhemilev, currently the "main inspiration" for the Crimean Tatars, lives. He has already been written about in the newspapers. We would only like to add one substantial fact to his biography: at the age of 43, M. Dzhemilev has already received seven criminal convictions, including for refusal to appear for military induction, for slander against the Soviet State and social order, and for other crimes. The same is true of his "associate," Reshat Dzhemilev, born in 1932. R. Dzhemilev has been convicted twice, including once for embezzlement of state property.

And these people are the leaders of the Crimean Tatars' so-called "national movement"! Today these people are dictating to hundreds of honest, conscientious working

people what they should do and how they should do it: when to write petitions, when to take up money, when to prepare for a trip to Moscow...

D. Seytveliyeva, Mustafa Dzhemilev's sister and a resident of Abinsk, read an "Appeal to the People," which she had received from her brother, at assemblies of Crimean Tatars. This document contains an appeal to not stop halfway or slacken activism.

The extremists resort to open blackmail against the members of initiative groups established locally for the purpose of rendering assistance to the state commission, attempting to compromise them, accuse them of "collusion with the authorities" and "betrayal of the people's national interests." In this manner they have attempted to isolate R. I. Kurtiyev, chairman of the kray's initiative group.

Refat Ismailovich Kurtiyev has already done many years of active volunteer work pertaining to the study of his people's history. It was his activism which drew attention to him during the recent events, and for that reason he was elected chairman of the kray-level group. Subsequent to participation in the meeting of the study group in Moscow he took upon himself the difficult job of informing as many of his fellow Crimean Tatars as possible of what was discussed at that meeting. For this purpose he undertook trips to Krymsk, Abinsk, Gelendzhik, Temryuk and other places, where he told of the meeting in many hours of conversation.

And what happened? Local leaders created an atmosphere of distrust around him and accused him of spreading false information. They were displeased by R. I. Kurtiyev's sober reasoning; Kurtiyev also favors autonomy and is in absolute agreement with all the Crimean Tatars' demands, but he differs from the extremists in his choice of means for attaining those ends. In speeches to his fellow Crimean Tatars he appeals for calm, restraint and patience and asks them to aid the state commission in its work instead of further exacerbating the situation.

A communist and colonel of the reserve, R. I. Kurtiyev "does not suit" a certain segment of the Crimean Tatars as a leader. At their meetings these people diligently elect one another.

And who are the people they choose?

Amet Abduramanov, born 1913, presently retired. In 1945 he was convicted of desertion by a military tribunal, and was later convicted of violation of Soviet laws on another occasion.

Murat Voyennyy, born 1940, has a previous conviction, was fired from his job for flagrant violation of labor legislation.

But it is probably Bekir Umerov, who has already been written about in this newspaper, who considers himself the principal figure in the "movement."

An idea popular among the extremists, i.e. that they are not permitted to visit the Crimea or hold residence permits there, was unexpectedly refuted by an incident involving B. Umerov himself. Umerov made a trip to Crimea Oblast with the obvious intention of casting himself in the role of a "martyr" not permitted to enter his homeland. He was a martyr to enter. Furthermore, he was registered as a resident. Here is his address: the village of Chistenkoye, which is near Simferopol.

He was registered, so now he should live in peace and work, especially since our country has given him higher education. But that prospect does not suit Umerov, because that would transform him into an ordinary person, one of the rank and file, like everyone else... But he wants to be in the public eye, he wants glory, he wants to play at being a "leader." And this 29-year-old man, who has not held a job for six months now, has returned home to Krymsk, where he has a house, and is now living there without official registration and is not listed on military rolls, but is instead actively "heading the movement" and traveling around the kray and the country.

For his "business trips" he obviously borrows freely from the "people's" money collected from the public, including money from retirees, veterans and large families. And a lot of money is required. At least, it is known that while in Moscow B. Umerov ate in restaurants and traveled around the capital exclusively in taxis.

Now Bekir Umerov has become quite a famous individual: his name has been mentioned abroad, although it is not to his credit that it was mentioned in the most strongly anti-Soviet circles.

In one recent edition of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* there was an article entitled "Mister Burns' Trip." The author of that article, recounting the thoroughly unofficial contacts made in our country by Sean Burns, first secretary of the U.S. Embassy in the USSR, writes:

"What sort of contacts these were became evident from a statement issued by the USSR MFA concerning incitement by certain employees of the U.S. Embassy of street demonstrations in Moscow by Crimean Tatars not resident in the city. That statement notes the following: 'Certain American diplomats are attempting to inspire nationalistic manifestations and prompt certain Crimean Tatars currently in Moscow to undertake anti-Soviet demonstrations... In this respect the most active role has been played by S. Burns, the embassy's first secretary, who has in recent days had several conspiratorial meetings with extremist elements.'"

Soviet television exposed Burns, showing one of his meetings with B. Umerov, the most aggressive of the extremists. And on 21 August the press in New York

suddenly published a proclamation by the Unification Church, a religious/political sect, in defense of Umerov. This organization was founded by the well-known anti-communist [Sun Myung] Moon.

In a skyscraper on 8th Avenue in New York, all 40 stories of which are occupied by the Unification Church, I saw a large number of pamphlets containing American publicity for Umerov and sensational announcements by Moon's headquarters of the founding in New York of... a "Committee for the Preparation of a Demonstration in Moscow."

While the security guards were calling my inquiry over the intercom system to the founders of the brand-new "committee," I read in its announcements that it had already been joined by French neo-Nazis from Le Pen's National Front, as well as by American anticommunists, emissaries from the Afghan dushman in the United States and Western Europe, bourgeois Baltic separatists who have fled from our country to America, and West German revanchists. A colorful group!

"We unabashedly promote anticommunism," I was told by Garrett Davis, an American who is chairman of the "committee." "We are offering a direct challenge to your Soviet regime."

"Are you pinning your hopes on adventurists like the ones currently agitating among the Crimean Tatars?"

"We would be very happy to get the Crimean Tatars involved."

"Are you seriously planning a demonstration in Moscow? And when will it take place?"

"I cannot name the exact date yet," smirked Davis.

While Mr. Davis is making plans to conduct a demonstration in Moscow, Bekir Umerov has decided to offer his own challenge. To whom? To the authorities, to society? Because it was his idea to organize nothing less than a "march/campaign" from Taman to the Crimea. His closest "associates" in the organization of the campaign are Abdurashit Dzhapparov, Ismet Sadykov, Avva Azamatova, Riza Abdullayev and Reval Neshayev. Umerov himself envisions himself at the head of the column, in which he would like to get as many of his fellow Tatars as possible to march. (Incidentally, we would not be surprised if at the last minute the instigator himself were to "magnanimously" step aside and let the crowd march toward the Kerch Strait by itself.)

What can be said about this?

The goal of the people organizing the "campaign" is clear: what they need is a noisy and, if possible, scandalous action which will attract public attention. The people called upon to make up the crowd are in this case merely a means of achieving that goal.

One gets the impression that for the "leaders" resolution of the Crimean Tatar issue has long since become less important than the process of "struggle" to resolve the issue. It is for this reason that they so frequently change their tactics and tricks, making efforts to keep the situation tense.

This summer, both at their meetings and in written statements, they actively raised issues pertaining to infringement on the social and cultural needs of Crimean Tatars. Here is an excerpt from the stenographic record of a meeting at the krayispolkom on 4 August of this year. Speaking is A. Kh. Kerimov, a war veteran from Anapa:

"We are fighting for our language, for our culture... Our people has lost its language, its music, its literature, its customs and mores. That is what we need to restore."

But in September, when in a number of places discussion of practical matters began — discussion concerning the introduction of elective courses in the Tatar language in schools, the publication of a duplicate of the rayon newspaper in that language, the establishment of creative collectives, etc. — the very same representatives stated: "We do not need any of this." What they are saying is that until the underlying question, that of autonomy, is resolved, they are opposed to the development of the Crimean Tatar people's culture locally.

The basic question is being considered by the state commission, but already it would be possible to resolve many separate issues at the local level, thereby overcoming those shortcomings which actually do exist and satisfying more fully the populace's social and cultural needs. And what about those people, the majority, who have their own homes and farms here in the Kuban Region, who have put down roots in this soil and do not intend to move anywhere? What about their cultural needs?

We feel that such tactics can only be interpreted in one way. Their objective is first of all to bring up an issue and then, when it is nearing a positive resolution, to reject the very postulation of the question, in order to maintain a situation of tension.

That is the intention of the "campaign" to the Crimea. Having exhausted many of their provocative ideas, the extremist leaders are preparing to launch a new, noisy undertaking and are attempting to lure their gullible fellow citizens into it, depicting the "campaign" as something which is completely harmless and even a sacred part of the "national movement."

Is it harmless?

We would like for the people who have gotten involved in this provocation to realize where their leaders could be taking them.

Firstly, it is appropriate to recall applicable decisions by the ispolkoms of local soviets of people's deputies on regulations governing the conducting of meetings, rallies, processions and demonstrations, violation of which regulations will be regarded as an antisocial act and will be blocked accordingly by the organs of public order.

Also imagine the other consequences of such an action: massive absenteeism from work. It should not be assumed that labor collectives and administration will be sympathetic this time. It is more likely that they will adhere strictly to principle.

Those people preparing to join the "march" need to realize clearly the physical hardships associated with it in this rather cold autumn, including the danger of catching colds and infectious illnesses.

Finally, they should also stop and consider this: who is supposed to guarantee you, esteemed comrades, safety on the road, a place to sleep, food, medical assistance and so on? Perhaps Umerov is prepared to take the responsibility for all these things and for everyone involved?

It appears that such problems are of scant concern to the organizers of this "forced march." They are interested in something else: delivering a challenge.

But those who are being deluded by Umerov and his followers still have time to reconsider and not get involved in this provocation.

Crimean Tatars are Soviet people. And those of them who truly love their people and are thinking about its future destiny should realize that that destiny is not to oppose the multinational Soviet people and Soviet authorities. No, its destiny is to live in unity with the entire Soviet people as a family, to live according to the laws of the Soviet State.

It was the Soviet State and the party, and not some unknown overseas uncle, which acknowledged the injustice of the decision made 43 years ago with regard to the Crimean Tatars, which have also acknowledged that there still exists an issue pertaining to that people even today, which have begun to examine that issue and work toward a solution. A solution, as has repeatedly been stated, which will be in the traditions of friendship among peoples and in the interests of the multiethnic Soviet state.

12825

#### Effectiveness of Bilik Society Propaganda Questioned

18310419a [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 12 September 1987 carries on page 3 an 1100-word article by Sh. Ahmadov, section director of

the AzSSR Bilik Society; the article is headlined "Ideological Work and Problems of Restructuring." It notes that "the republic Bilik society unites 42,000 lecturers, and more than 270,000 lectures have been given under its sponsorship over the last year. The quantity is not small, but what about quality?" He points out that "we are not always achieving what we wish" and, taking the work of the people's universities as an example, claims that "work at many of them is qualitatively lower than the demands of the day. Audience interest in meetings has dropped because there is little discussion on matters of concern to them." Bilik organizations in Gotchay, Gazakh, Gakh, Gusar, and Yardymly Rayons are singled out for special criticism.

/12232

#### **Azeri Publishers Receive Pushtu Contract**

18310419b [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 19 September 1987 carries on page 3 a 400-word interview with Mohammad Akbar Kargar, chairman of the DRA State Press and Publishing Committee, on terms of the joint protocol for cooperation 1987-1990 signed by himself and N.S. Ibrahimov, chairman of the AzSSR State Committee for Publishing, Printing and the Book Trade. "In the protocol it was stipulated that Azeri printers, who are increasing literary output for the friendly country, would broaden this activity even further over the next 4 years. Along with printing books in Dari, the publication of a number of books, primarily primers and a short political dictionary, in Pushtu, which is spoken by a substantial portion of the DRA's population, is envisaged."

/12232

#### **Afghan Veterans Feted in Nasimi Rayon**

18310419c [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 18 September 1987 carries on pp 1, 2 an 1100-word article by Fazilat Ismaylova headlined "Battles and Memories" on a meeting sponsored by the Nasimi Raykom honoring local veterans of the war in Afghanistan. She notes that "attention is being given in the rayon to improving the material and living conditions of soldiers and families of those killed in action in fulfilling their military service in Afghanistan. Recently, the invalid B. Shukurov was guaranteed a one-room apartment, and 12 people were registered for an improvement in their housing. Based on an authorization from the military commissariat, telephones were installed in a number of houses."

/12232

#### **Radio Baku 'Southern Azerbaijan' Desk Highlighted**

18310419d [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 25 September 1987 carries on page 1 a 100-word unsigned report noting that "a new program has gone on the air at the Southern Azerbaijan chief editorial board of Azerbaijan radio. This program, called 'Korpu/Bridge' is based on letters from listeners. This program, written by the writer-journalist Agshin Babayev, is done in the form of a lively dialogue with listeners abroad, discusses the development of our republic's economy and culture, its economic-cultural cooperation with foreign countries, the paths of development of the Azeri language and the internationalist tradition of our people."

/12232



**Comprehensive Lenin Film Documentary Debuts;  
Some Archives Closed**

18120021 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
No 44, 8-15 Nov 87 p 2

[Article by Natalya Izyumova]

[Text] Lenin speaking at a mass rally of protest against the treacherous killing of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. Lenin at the Second Congress of the Communist International. These are scenes from the new film, "Cinodocuments," produced by Central Television as a sequel to the series, "V.I. Lenin. Pages from His Biography," to be broadcast on 7 November. The film incorporates all known documentary material featuring Lenin, without a single omission.

It takes us back to the year 1917. We see the events of the February revolution, the excited crowds in Nevsky Prospekt, Petrograd. The dynamic camera work strives to transcend the dumbness of the silent film. Lenin is not there in those scenes. Together with his comrades he is on the way to Russia from Switzerland where he spent years in emigration. Travelling to Russia via Stockholm he was filmed for the first time there, as the press reported.

But the film did not survive. All that's left is a photo in which Lenin is seen together with Nadezhda Krupskaya, Mikha Tskhakaya, Grigory Zinovyev and Inessa Armand.

"History did not lavish film documents about Lenin on us," said Viktor Lisakovich, the film director. "Photographs are few, film clips are fewer still. Time has treated them roughly, too. What we had to deal with were bits and pieces of badly scratched film. As many metres have been lost as survived and appeared in this collection. Of course, in some cases we have photos which can compensate for the lost film. Photographers generally worked side by side with cinematographers. The commentary is read by actor Nikolai Gubenko, the script was written by Viktor Listov and Alexander Novogrudsky, music by Vladimir Rubin."

Looking at the old and technically imperfect clips we miraculously become Lenin's contemporaries, if only for a short time. We see the May day celebrations of 1918 with a military and aircraft parade in Khodynskoye Pole near Moscow. This is the earliest surviving reel featuring Lenin. The filming was supervised by Mikhail Koltsov, a film reporter later to become a famous journalist. We see Vladimir Lenin, Nadezhda Krupskaya, Maria Ulyanova, and the commentator reads Koltsov's notes about the event: "All Moscow was there on Khodynskoye Pole. Lenin also came to look at the Red aviation. An army of photographers besieged him with requests: 'Comrade Lenin, let us take pictures of you.' Lenin did not even have time to refuse..."

On 30 August 1918, Fanny Kaplan, member of the Socialist Revolutionary Party, seriously wounded Lenin. We are shown the medical bulletins about his condition. The recovery took a long time. To confirm the glad tidings a cameraman filmed Lenin and Bonch-Bruyevich, the Sovnarkom business-manager, taking a walk in the Kremlin. We see Lenin raising his arm and the commentator explains that the gesture was meant to reassure people that his wound did not hurt any longer. We also hear the voice of Yelizaveta Drabkina, an old Bolshevik: "Having seen these clips hundreds of times I never cease to wonder at this complete absence of affectation or pose, at the air of naturalness and shyness Lenin displayed in front of the cinecamera. Not a trace of pomp or attempted grandeur. Here he is just an ordinary yet inwardly great man..."

"We did not set ourselves the task of projects a well-rounded image of Lenin," director Lisakovich continues. "This would be impossible in an hour-long film. We attempted to do that in the TV series, 'V.I. Lenin. Pages from His Biography.' By contrast, 'Cinodocuments' are just a sketch for a portrait which is to be finished by Time, to use a poetic metaphor. We just wanted to show the living Lenin, because neither his photos nor painted portraits can do it the way the moving pictures can. On film he is all motion, his expression and moods change momentarily and almost imperceptibly. It is no accident that Antoly Lunacharsky said Vladimir Ilych was quite like himself only on film... You might have noticed that the documentary clips are shown to the accompaniment of soft background music, sometimes in complete silence, when we hear nothing but the soft hissing of the reel. We did our best not to overload our audience with information, not to pour too many words on them, a drawback common to many documentaries. The important thing is just to look at the living Lenin..."

This is indeed how the film is made: we watch an old reel in silence, and when it comes to an end, we find ourselves in a modern cutting room, where film director Viktor Lisakovich and actor Nikolai Gubenko talk about the rushes we have just seen and the events of that time. Then we are shown more documentary material.

The year 1919. Thousands of Muscovites have converged on Soviet square to protest against the killing of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. the rally opened with the speech of Lev Kamenev, the then chairman of the Moscow City Soviet. Lenin spoke next.

"Various episodes of the rally were filmed by two different cameramen. The reels were kept in different archives, dated wrongly, and it was impossible to know they covered the same event.

One of the reels filmed on Soviet Square was used by Mikhail Romm in his film, "The Living Lenin." The other one has never been used before. "Cinodocuments" will present the full record of the event.

"The living Lenin" was first shown in 1958. The film incorporated many but not all of the documentary clips featuring Lenin. Many film and photo documents were not included because Lenin appeared together with the "wrong" characters. Many frames were "treated" to satisfy the official version of history.

"They simply cut and edited the 'undesirable parts' of the film. Look here, for example..."

Lisakovich showed a frame from the 1958 film; Lenin speaking at a rally on 1 May 1919. The people standing around him are impossible to identify because their faces are darkened. In "Cinedocuments" the same scene is shown in its original uncensored version. One of the men standing next to Lenin was Vladimir Zagorsky, Secretary of the Moscow Party Committee, who died later in 1919 at the hands of counterrevolutionaries.

For the first time the TV viewers will see the full length of the film shot during the funeral of Chairman Yakov Sverdlov of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. Marching in the funeral procession next to Lenin are Nadezhda Krupskaya and Alexandra Kollontai.

"Even a year ago we could not think of ever being able to use all the documentary material stored in the archives of the Institute of Marxism and Leninism. But the Institute's archives have been flung open to us. However, we did come across instances of old mentality. For example, we had difficulty in getting access to the photo archives of the Central Museum of the Revolution of the USSR. Under various pretext we were not allowed to publish their material in our film."

Anyway, the new thinking is consolidating its position in our life, as is evident from the fact that the film "cinedocuments" has been produced and is soon to be screened.

[1]2232

### **Seminar Examines Individual, Personality Factors in CPSU History**

18300020 Moscow VOPROSY ISTORII KPSS in Russian No 9, Sep 87 pp 150-155

[Article by V.G. Veryaskin, candidate of historical sciences, docent: "On the Personality Factor in the History of the CPSU"]

[Text] A seminar on the personality factor in CPSU history was held on 11 June at the CPSU History Department of the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee. Also taking part in its work were scientific fellows of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism at the CPSU Central Committee; instructors

from the Moscow Higher Party School, the Military-Political Academy imeni V.I. Lenin, and the Higher Komsomol School at the Komsomol Central Committee; and other scientific and academic institutes in the capital.

Opening the session, the chief of the CPSU History Department, Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee, Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor N.N. Maslov noted that party historians are faced with a most important task: to raise the theoretical level of scientific research, and totally overcome the stagnation phenomena which had taken shape in a period during which, in the words of M.S. Gorbachev, "Lively discussion and theoretical thought" had forsaken the social sciences, "and authoritative analyses and opinions had become indisputable truths, subject only to commentary."<sup>1</sup>

The uneasiness over the present state of party-history research expressed at the All Union Conference of Social Sciences Department Chiefs is altogether justified; it is connected in particular with the depersonalization of many historical events<sup>2</sup>, which reduces the ideological-moral and educational value of the scientific works, and the interest of the Soviet people toward them.

We are altogether correct in looking upon historical events as the result of the activity of the working masses and the party; but at the same time we often do not illustrate the role of specific people in specific circumstances—their fate and their successes, as well as their blunders and mistakes—thereby depersonalizing history and depriving it of human heroism and drama. After all, while acknowledging the popular masses as the decisive force of historical progress, Marxism-Leninism does not at the same time deny nor does it belittle the roles of individual persons in history. "History," Lenin pointed out, "also consists of the actions of individuals, and it is the task of the social sciences to explain these actions..."<sup>3</sup>

Prominent personalities and leaders have always played a most important role in the revolutionary struggle of the workers. "...We are profoundly convinced," said Lenin in his eulogy of Ya.A. Sverdlov, "that the proletarian revolution in Russia and throughout the world brings forth groups and groups of people, and brings forth the multitudes in the proletarians class and from the working peasantry, who will provide that practical knowledge of life; if not the individual, then the collective organizational talent, without which the millions-strong army of the proletariat cannot achieve the victory."<sup>4</sup>

The finest representatives of the working class, the peasantry and the revolutionary intelligentsiya linked their own lives with the fate of the Communist Party. Its history is the history of millions of people, representing different generations and different strata of society. They are not cogs in the party and state mechanism, but individuals.

In examining at the seminar the problem of the personality factor in CPSU history—a problem almost forgotten by party historians—we shall thereby support the development of the teaching of CPSU History, and more profound research in party-historical processes and phenomena.

Also delivering reports at the seminar were Doctors of Historical Sciences, Professors Yu.V. Derbinov, G.V. Petryakov, and I.Ye. Gorelov, who have examined various aspects of the problem. The first of the speakers, after subjecting to critical analysis the given viewpoint on contemporary scientific and academic literature, contrasted it with current practice in party life. Yu.V. Derbinov noted that the universal sociological law on the decisive role of the popular masses in history, discovered by Karl Marx, is declared in literature in isolation from practical social experience. The dogmatization of theoretical precepts has hindered the interpretation of complex phenomena in social life and as a result has led to the depersonalization of the history of society and the party. However at times this did not prevent overemphasizing the role and significance of certain leading figures, and the exaggeration of their personal contribution in all spheres of the life and activity of society.

Academic literature on CPSU history and party construction has been created in accordance with a strictly monosemantic plan, in which the principles of historical method, as well as class and party principles, have been interpreted in such a way that the creative origins in the activity of the Communist Party have been emasculated, while those who took part in the events had always occupied previously-stipulated positions; they were divided into only two camps, and they struggled with one another by methods known in advance. As a result, only a sketchy outline entered the popular consciousness, inasmuch as the actors were removed from history.

Presently, however, in conditions of increasing interest in history and in our past; in an atmosphere of reinterpretation of certain historical stages and the activity of specific persons—it is inappropriate to try to establish some sort of balance by means of displaying positive and negative heroes. Marxist-Leninist methodology offers a tested, comprehensive and systematic analysis of historical realities, which guarantees objectivity not by means of a voluntaristic selection of personages, but by means of illuminating events and phenomena in their full volume, with all of the complexities of interconnections and interactions.

The necessity to take full cognizance of the bitter lessons of history is clear and understandable to all of us. The time has come to re-evaluate many positions which were previously defended and which had been considered unshakable. And this is associated primarily with glasnost. It is namely with glasnost and not with voting—which is resorted to in those instances when one seeks a pretext for shifting responsibility from one's self and laying it onto the collective. Simple votes and even secret

ballots hardly ever serve the criteria of democracy. After all, sometimes the truth is proclaimed by a creative and questioning minority; hence time is required in order to get the majority, which is standing in the way of progress, to understand it.

Using concrete examples from the life of the party and Soviet society, and from the realization of the cadre policies of the CPSU in contemporary conditions, Yu.V. Derbinov traced the processes connected with the objectively-conditioned increase in the role of the individual in active and conscious participation in the restructuring of all aspects of the life of a socialist society. The speaker stressed that these processes permit more profoundly disclosing the most complex mechanisms in the operation of the general sociological laws discovered by the founding fathers of scientific communism, and not reducing them to a primitive and one-sided outline; they permit learning to take all-round consideration of the objective requirements in the actions of the CPSU and all its elements, in the name of successfully putting into action the strategic policy for accelerating the socio-economic development of our country; and they permit implementing changes which open new possibilities for making use of the advantages of the socialist system.

Substantiating the theoretical and political urgency of the problem under examination, G.V. Petryakov pointed out that it has not been developed sufficiently in Soviet historiography. In particular, questions associated with the personality cult of Stalin require in-depth and all-round research. General, principled analyses on this count were provided in the documents of the 20th Party Congress; in the CPSU Central Committee Resolution, "On Overcoming the Personality Cult and its Consequences" of 30 June 1956; and in a number of other materials. However, one can hardly consider these questions exhausted today for party-historical science.

Additional scholarly research and disclosure of the objective and subjective reasons for the emergence of the Stalin personality cult and its specific manifestations are required. Fully-supported analysis must be provided of the negative consequences of this phenomenon in the various spheres of social and political life. One cannot but object strongly to the one-sided interpretation of Lenin's "Letter to the Congress," not only in scholarly publications, but also in the teaching of the social sciences. Instead of in-depth all-round analysis of this most important document and disclosure of its historical and political basis, one still encounters an artificial "truncation" of Lenin's analyses, and conjectural "editing" of Lenin's text.

"On the basis of the documents," the speaker continued, "the question of the appointment of Stalin as General Secretary of the party Central Committee at the April 1922 Central Committee Plenum, at which in fact this post was first established, should be completely and

thoroughly illuminated." As early as December 1922 Lenin had raised the question of the expedience of naming another person to replace Stalin in this post.

The question of the time of the appearance of the personality cult also requires additional research. Until recently, the accent here had been placed on the latter years of Stalin's life, which, in the opinion of G.V. Petryakov, is very likely unfounded. The Conference of Agrarians and Marxists held in December 1929, at which Stalin made a speech "On Questions of an Agrarian Policy in the USSR," provides a definite landmark in the coming-into-being of this phenomenon. Subsequently his infamous letter to the editors of the magazine *Proletarskaya Revolyutsiya*, "On Certain Questions of the History of Bolshevism," appeared in the November 1931 issue. And finally in 1938, the *Istoriya VKP(b). Kratkiy kurs* [History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks): Short Course] was published, the author of which was revealed in the post-war years as Stalin. These, of course, are merely a few of the most obvious landmarks on the theoretical front in the coming-into-being of the personality cult, which have appeared in theoretical and political analyses, in peremptory instructions from Stalin, and so on.

As far as an overall political analysis of Stalin's role is concerned, it goes without saying that in-depth scholarly analysis and all-round accounting of the objective and subjective factors are necessary. The following three features should be considered as starting points: first, the generally-acknowledged role of Stalin as one of the leading figures of the party; secondly, the massive repression and the grossest violations of socialist legality during the years of the personality cult, which are also inseparable from the name of Stalin—not everything here has been sufficiently studied, nor has it become available in the light of glasnost. And finally, the third important feature: the profoundly negative influence of the atmosphere of the personality cult on all aspects of the development of society, and intellectual development as well. "It was necessary to pay a great price for the retreat from Leninist principles and methods of building a new society; for the violations of socialist legality and democratic norms of life in the party and society; for the voluntaristic errors; for the dogmatism in thinking and the inertia in practical activities."<sup>5</sup> These words from the Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee to the Soviet People in connection with the 70th Anniversary of the Great October Revolution are unconditionally also an analysis of the situation in the party and the Soviet state in the period of the Stalin personality cult.

While speaking of the personality cult and its negative manifestations in various spheres, one must not neglect to note its negative influence on the development of party-historical science, which also requires in-depth and honest investigation. In the opinion of the speaker this science is still timidly stepping around the solution to

many important problems associated with the personality factor in history and with its positive and negative manifestations. The lessons of truth in the light of the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress should be more persistently and steadily put into practice. In this connection one would also like to see a more active role for the magazine *Voprosy Istorii KPSS* [Questions of CPSU History].

In his report, I.Ye. Gorelov spoke of the need to respect the memory of the Russian revolutionaries, and of returning from oblivion the names of many of those who took part in the liberation movement and socialist construction. "Throughout history," Lenin stressed, "not a single class has achieved dominance without producing its own political leaders and its own leading representatives, capable of organizing a movement and leading it." "Rallying around the leader of the revolution were

people who were tenaciously purposeful; people of crystalline honor, and unprecedented courage and heroism. Most of them had endured prison, penal labor, and exile. "They are people who did not spend themselves on fruitless terrorist acts as individuals, but operated persistently and unswervingly among the proletarian masses, helping them to develop their consciousness, their organization, and their revolutionary initiative."<sup>7</sup> Many of them perished in the struggle with the autocracy, in the years of the revolution and the civil wars, and were subjected to groundless persecution in the period of the personality cult.

In the first years of Soviet rule a large undertaking was conducted to gather materials on the most prominent figures in the revolution. Here Istpart [Commission for Gathering and Study of Materials on the History of the October Revolution and the History of the Communist Party] and its local offices played an important role. The appeal of Istpart Chairman M.S. Olminskiy, "From Istpart to all the Comrades" stressed that "In the years of our struggle with autocracy, and subsequently in the years of the civil war, many comrades were carried off to the tombs... The life of each of them is a particle of party history, and a stone in the construction of our communist future. One cannot live without a past, without knowledge of one's own history; and one cannot know history without knowing its actors."<sup>8</sup>

Historians of the 1920's and 30's have done a great deal to prepare and publish scholarly biographies of the heroes of the Bolshevik underground and the fighters for Soviet Rule. Especially valued are such books as, *Bratskaya mogila. Biograficheskiy slovar umershikh i pogibshikh chlenov Moskovskoy organizatsii RKP* [A Common Grave: A Biographical Dictionary of the Members of the Moscow Organization of the Russian Communist Party who Died or Perished] (Ed. I & II, Moscow, 1922-1923); *Bolsheviki Moskvyy. 1905* [Bolsheviks of Moscow in 1905] (Moscow, 1925); *Geroi i mucheniki proletarskoy revolyutsii* [Heroes and Martyrs of the Proletarian Revolution] (Ed. I, Moscow, 1924); *Politicheskaya katorga i*

*ssylka. Biograficheskiy spravochnik Obshchestva politkatorzhan i sslynoposelentsev* [Political Hard Labor and Exile: A Biographical Reference of the Society of Political Prisoners at Penal Servitude and Exile Settlements] (Moscow, 1934) and others.

Unfortunately in the years to follow this most necessary work was arbitrarily interrupted. The fundamental reason for this, in the opinion of the speaker, can be considered the aforementioned letter from Stalin to the magazine *Proletarskaya revolyutsiya* and the subsequent publishing of the *Istorii VKP(b). Kratkiy kurs*. However even at the present time the preparation and publication of biographies of Leninist Bolsheviks, heroes of the October Revolution and builders of socialism is not being given proper attention. It is the duty of the historians to fill in the gaps, for the story of the lives and activities of these people is one of the best and most effective means of communist education of the Soviet people and the youth above all.

Other participants in the seminar also spoke out in the course of the discussion. The Chief of the Party Construction Department, Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee, Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor O.G. Obichkin noted that the subjective factor in general, and the personal qualities of the participants in the revolutionary movement in particular, played an important role in the history of our party. The orator characterized the basic features of the proletarian revolutionary Leninists, brought up in the years of the underground. These are theoretical tempering, trust in their own convictions, and the highest moral qualities. Far from all were able to withstand the severe school of illegal work; but those who passed it with honors comprised the nucleus of the party of Bolsheviks, which led the struggle of the masses in the days of the Great October Revolution and in the years of socialist construction.

The second generation of leaders consisted of people who had entered the party in the period of the revolution and in the first years of Soviet rule. In the opinion of O.G. Obichkin, they were significantly inferior to their older comrades in theoretical preparation, for at times they had neither the time nor the opportunity for it. This was the basic reason for the limitation of their representation which, in turn, led to dogmatism and an oversimplified approach to the problems of socialist construction which had sprung up, and to overemphasizing the role of naked bureaucratic administration and arbitrary methods of leadership. Although Stalin belonged to the first generation, subsequently he differed with them more and more, promoted representatives of the second generation, and sought and found support in them. Therein, in the opinion of O.G. Obichkin, lies the principal reason for the slaughter of the leading cadres in the second half of the 1930's, which involved primarily fighters from the Leninist Guards. It was impossible to corrupt them, but they could be exterminated.

In conclusion the speaker noted that the time has come once and for all to reject the practice adopted in party history literature to simply list the names of party figures, and to fully and completely point out what each of them actually did for the revolution and for the victory of socialism in our country. There must be expanded publication of biographical works; a scholarly biography of Stalin must be prepared, as well as biographical sketches of those figures who had once stood with the party and occupied leading responsibilities in it, but had subsequently taken part in anti-Leninist, anti-party groupings—not excluding such figures as Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinovyev and others.

In understanding the "personality factor," said Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor Yu.S. Vasyutin, to this day one can trace a close association between the events of the late 1930's and the present. For a long time now the Soviet people have been influenced by the moral-ethical situation which took shape in the party and the country in the years of the mass slaughter of the leading party, state and military cadres. This situation to a significant degree conditioned the defeats of the first years of the Great Patriotic War as well; it could not help but have an effect on the postwar years, nor influence the stagnation which came about, nor the disintegration of parts of the party cadres, which was so frankly and openly spoken of at the 27th CPSU Congress and the subsequent Central Committee Plenums. This atmosphere was reflected in the psychology of the people—especially young people. And we the historians must make a profound study of these processes, expose them, and openly and honestly tell of the reasons for the appearance of the negative phenomena in the 1930's as well as in the 1960's and 1970's.

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor A.A. Chernobayev noted the keen interest amid wide circles of the Soviet public in the personality factor in history. Testifying to this are the numerous articles, novellas, novels and plays published in recent times. Their appearance is a gratifying phenomenon, and they should be welcomed. However, the scholars must have their word as well; the moreso, since one cannot agree with all the positions in the literary works which have been published. There are numerous extremely subjective evaluations of real historical figures, in the speaker's opinion, in A. Rybakov's novel, "*Deti Arbata*" [Children of the Arbat].

"In the process of working on biographical essays on the brilliant but not exceptional personalities of A.Ya. Arosyev and A.I. Todorskiy," Chernobayev continues, "one had to deal with many difficulties, at times unexpected ones." Both of these men were persecuted in their own times and subsequently were totally rehabilitated; however, even today it is practically impossible to tell of certain events in their lives. The problem was, that if a book told of the years 1937-1938, the biography would not see the light of day. It was suggested to speak of this

in on a general plane, in aesopian terms. Even today it is far from easy to publish a work in which one attempts to provide a comprehensive characterization of this or that historic figure.

This situation can be explained, A.A. Chernobayev believes, by many circumstances. One of them is the unceremonious interference of publishers in the author's text. It has become urgently necessary to restructure the activities of the publishers and to regulate their relationships with the authors.

Candidate of Historical Sciences **A.G. Latyshev**, chief of the International Communist and Workers' Movement Department at the Moscow Higher Party School, spoke of the restoration of historical truth with respect to the leaders of many communist parties and prominent figures in the Communist International who fell victims to the Stalin personality cult in the 1930's. How can one explain the fact that the birthdays of prominent internationalists, brothers-in-arms of Lenin, are not observed, except in terms of over-cautiousness? For example, 4 May 1987 marked the 100th birthday of Hugo Eberlein (Albert), one of the founding fathers of the Communist Party of Germany, who represented it at the Constituent Assembly of the Comintern, and who was one of three (along with Lenin and the Swiss Platten) permanent members of the Presidium of the 1st Congress of the Comintern. Hugo Eberlein lived a brilliant, heroic life. *Neues Deutschland*, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, published a detailed article which, incidentally, reminded us of his arrest in 1937. But in general we have observed this anniversary. And there are a number of other examples such as this.

The speaker noted still another characteristic circumstance. In the foreword to the published poems of Nikolay Gumilyev it is stated that his life was tragically cut short in 1921. But you see, no matter how prominent a poet Gumilyev was, he fought against Soviet Rule. And one must not utilize the same formula when speaking of him as is applied to the people who were groundlessly persecuted in the period of the personality cult.

Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor **V.M. Ivanov** stressed that populating the history of the CPSU with people is one of the most important and at the same time most complex tasks of our science. Unfortunately today we also quite often approach the illumination of the role of the individual in history from general sociological positions. For a poor social scientist this is sufficient, but for history it is not. A more in-depth, concrete approach is needed in order to determine the contribution made by one person or another to history.

In the speaker's opinion, a dialectical method provides the opportunity to consider in aggregate such aspects of this approach as the ontological, the axiological and the gnoseological. For the time being the ontological approach is predominant, answering the question: What has the given individual accomplished? At the same

time, unfortunately, we very often analyze what was accomplished in the past from the position of the latest time, forgetting that a historian must remove himself to the epoch under study and illuminate the contribution of this or that individual on the basis of a realistic estimate of the situation in those years.

An axiological approach permits casting light on the internal, motivating reasons which determined the peculiar features of a person's actions. V.M. Ivanov expressed his disagreement with the unproven assertions of certain literary figures (A. Rybakov, for example) of the fact that the basis for Stalin's actions lay in his value orientation toward absolute personal power. Such an assertion is easily refuted by the facts of true history, which lie at the basis of the ontological approach to the evaluation of this personality.

Finally, the gnoseological approach permits disclosing how the historical character himself evaluated the character of his actions. Stalin predominantly overestimated the value of authoritarian methods, which he counterpoised with anarchical methods which were especially dangerous in those conditions, and which had a strong social basis in the person of the petit bourgeois elements which still existed in the country at that time. But by virtue of the limitations of his world-view he failed to understand that petit bourgeois revolutionary activity can be overcome under conditions of socialism only on the basis of democratic methods, which Lenin had fought to establish.

"Recently," said Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor **L.V. Shirikov**, "articles have been published by authors struggling for truth in party-history science, but who understand it in a rather unique way—for they write only of negative phenomena. Such an approach, in the speaker's opinion, has also appeared in certain reports at the present seminar. In analyzing such a major and complex personality as Stalin, stress is laid predominantly on his mistakes and errors, and especially on the persecution of the 1930's. There is no doubt that these things took place. But is it just to connect this fact with the desires and actions of only one individual? L.V. Shirikov considers it naive to assert that only Stalin was the direct inspiration and organizer of the mass arrests and that he decided cases on his own arbitrary rule. There are grounds for doubts in the objectivity of such reasoning. As proof, the speaker cited Stalin's speech "On Shortcomings in Party Work and Measures for Liquidating Trotskyites and Other Double Dealers," and his concluding remarks at the February-March 1937 Plenum of the VKP(b) Central Committee, in which he spoke of "smashing and rooting out" only true Trotskyites—the enemies of the working class, traitors of our Motherland; and also the materials from the January 1938 Plenum of the VKB(b) Central Committee, which adopted the resolution "On Mistakes by Party Organizations in Expelling Communists from the Party; on the

Formal-Bureaucratic Attitude Toward Appeals from those Expelled from the VKP(b), and On Measures for Eliminating these Shortcomings."

All of this, stressed L.V. Shirikov, represent the most complex problems, which have not yet been worked out scientifically. The events noted still conceal a great deal of unexplored territory, which the sensation-lovers take advantage of.

"In this connection," the speaker stated in conclusion, "there is and urgent necessity to prepare and publish a scholarly biography of Stalin, free from subjective opinions or conjectural considerations."

Summing up the results of the seminar, N.N. Maslov noted that the question of the personality factor in the history of the CPSU is an insufficiently-studied scientific problem, the proof of which are the varying approaches and points of few held today, and expressed at the present conference.

Stressing the usefulness of such discussions, Maslov noted that not all questions connected with the personality factor were illuminated in the reports and speeches of the seminar participants; nor were identical answers given on all questions. However, the very fact of the discussion of such problems testifies to the fact that the collective of the CPSU History Department of the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee is striving not to avoid the complex and acute questions of modern times; that party-history scholars are attempting to reinterpret its separate periods from a position of the requirements of the day, and are trying to enlist party historians in working out the most important problems connected with the history of the CPSU.

#### Footnotes

1. Materials on the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 27-28 January 1987; Moscow, 1987, p 8.

2. *Kommunist*, 1986, No 15, p 14.

3. Lenin, V.I., *Polnoye sobraniye sochinenii* [Complete Collection of Works], Vol 1, p 415.

4. Lenin, *op.cit.*, Vol 38, p 79.

5. *Kommunist*, 1987, No 6, p 5.

6. Lenin, *op.cit.*, Vol 4, p 375.

7. *Ibid.*, Vol 20, p 83.

8. *Pechat i revolyutsiya* [The Press and the Revolution], Book 2, 1921, p 246.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda", "Voprosy istorii KPSS", 1987.

09006

#### Academician Tikhvinskiy on Historiography Under Perestroika

18300018 Moscow NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA in Russian No 4, Jul-Aug 87 pp 97-105

[Report by M.F. Zubkov on the general meeting of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, held 9 March 1987]

[Text] The general meeting of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which was devoted to the problems of restructuring the work of the department's scientific institutions in the light of the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, was held 9 March 1987.

S.L. Tikhvinskiy, member of the academy and the department's member-secretary, delivered an address entitled "On Restructuring the Work of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the Light of the Decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee." Recent months, he noted, have been saturated with major political and organizational measures of the party and government aimed at achieving a qualitatively new state of Soviet society on the basis of new thinking, a new philosophical view of the world and of humanity's present and future. The materials of the All-Union Conference of Social Science Department Heads, the Decree of the CPSU Central Committee on the Journal *Kommunist*, the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, and the speeches delivered by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, indicate that the party is leading the country to a qualitatively new and essentially revolutionary stage of development of Soviet society. The need for perestroika has been substantiated by a profound and bold theoretical analysis of the situation, by a precise identification of the problems that have come to a head and by a concrete indication of ways of solving them, which is evoking a sense of profound approval and confidence in successful realization of the plans that have been outlined and is drawing the Soviet people into the fight to bring all aspects of the life of Soviet society up-to-date.

The essence of the mechanism whereby socioeconomic development is held back and which took shape in the country during the seventies and early eighties was revealed at the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. To be specific, a desire to conceal the true state of affairs, to cover up shortcomings, to avoid treatment of the problematical issues of history and the present time has been felt ever more strongly in ideological work.

S.L. Tikhvinskiy emphasized that perestroika, everything that accompanies the process of renewal, acutely need invigoration of ideological and theoretical activity, which is unthinkable without a comprehensive analysis



of the past. Historical science is one of the social sciences; the party has set them crucial tasks related to the further improvement of socialism. As M.S. Gorbachev noted at the meeting with leaders of the mass information and propaganda media, "history has to be seen as it is." (1)

The editorial in the newspaper *Pravda* dated 11 February 1987, the speaker noted, said that the social sciences have been given a most crucial social assignment: to enrich our knowledge of the processes and phenomena of contemporary life and to conceptualize them thoroughly and comprehensively from party positions. But the pace, scale, and quality of restructuring of the work of social scientists have not so far been meeting the requirements of performance of that social assignment. (2) Soviet historians, S.L. Tikhvinskiy pointed out, must be self-critical enough to admit that the stagnant and negative phenomena were fully present in historical science as well, had an effect on the scientific level of historical works and on the organization of historical research.

Among the principal negative phenomena determining the low scientific level of many historical works the speaker mentioned one-sidedness in treatment of many phenomena and events and in evaluating the details of the historical process, especially modern and recent history; the presence of elements of scholastic politicization in conclusions and evaluations concerning the past and, as a consequence of that, a slide toward constructs that suit the particular moment; oversimplification of the past, disregard of the need to see life in all its complexity, to expose and exhibit the past as a dialectical process with its own inherent contradictions, in its unity and diversity, in its advances and shortcomings, in the struggle of the new with the old and outdated; the spread of silence concerning entire stages, events, and individual figures in history, above all in the history of the USSR; a revival of nationalistic treatments of the historical process in works on the history of the particular nationalities and ethnic minorities of the USSR; the lack of the necessary breadth in views of phenomena and events of the past and a lack of depth of analysis of the past, so that historical research has not revealed the trends of the historical process; neglect for questions of methodology, and the absence of fruitful and creative discussions that move historical science forward.

All of this, said S.L. Tikhvinskiy, has contributed to the fact that the full truth of history has remained unrevealed. Historical science has been unable to take advantage of its intellectual potential in theoretical conceptualization of the historical process, especially of the present time, it has not promoted as it should have an awareness of the vital problems and contradictions, social trends, and prospects, it has not performed its proper functions in ideological training, nor has it aroused public interest.

The speaker emphasized the need to discuss from every angle the question of how to restructure the entire work of the History Department of the USSR Academy of

Sciences and its scientific collectives and of what plans they should outline. In this connection he named a number of major works completed or published by institutes of the department in 1986 and also collective research planned for the 12th FYP: multivolume works on the history of the working class of the USSR, the peasantry in the USSR, the history of Europe, and the history of the Ancient East, and series of works on ethnic aspects and the cultural and everyday traditions of the nationalities of the USSR and contemporary ethnic processes, the multivolume work "Arkheologiya SSSR" [Archeology of the USSR], etc. They all need to be completed as soon as possible and at the highest level of quality. They correspond to the very spirit of Soviet historical science, which is collectivist in its essence, and they evoke a broad public response. But at this point it is not enough to be confined only to this list of topics: new aspects have to be discovered even in traditional topics, new topics have to be worked on that meet the demands of the time: for example, such as the problem of the human factor in history. With the exception of the History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, a topic like that has so far not been in the plans of history institutes.

Historians specializing in the Soviet period must concentrate attention on the tasks set by the party of studying the dialectics of the driving forces of socialism and of the shaping and manifestation of the interests of the various strata and groups in the particular stages of socialist construction; there is a need to outline and analyze the problems remaining from the past and to broaden the study of the entire experience of building socialism in the USSR and the other countries of the socialist commonwealth. Summarization of the results of socialist construction in the various stages and as a whole would best be done not only in the form of monographic studies, but also in a number of series of publications timed, say, for important historical milestones—the 50th anniversary of Victory in the Great Patriotic War, the 80th anniversary of the October Revolution. It would also be advisable to think about beginning work on preparation of the multivolume "Istoriya Velikogo Oktyabrya" [History of the Great October Revolution].

The Institute of Slavistics and Balkan Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences must pay closer attention to the ethnogenesis of the Slavs, to the current issues of socialist construction in the countries of eastern Europe, and to the history of the participation of the Soviet people in the Resistance movement in those countries, and it must study thoroughly the petit bourgeois ideological currents of the East European countries.

It is of decisive importance in improving the quality and effectiveness of historical research, the speaker emphasized, to deepen its theoretical-methodological and historiographic foundations, to broaden the available sources of information and to improve the methods used in this research. The Scientific Council for the Comprehensive Problem "Patterns of Historical Development of



Society and of the Transition From One Socioeconomic Formation to Another" and the World History Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which are drafting the program-forecast up to the year 2000 entitled "Theory of Historical Science," must step up their work. It must be made a rule to include in all the projects to be done sections on the theory of historiography that will show the state of the topic being studied in world science and the opposition between ideas and conceptions.

The real return to society from historical science is related to the truthfulness with which objective phenomena of the past are reflected, to demonstration of their impact on contemporary life, to summarization of the processes of the gradual development of humanity, countries, and peoples in all their complexity and contradictoriness. Only through such an approach do the lessons of history truly become lessons of patriotism, of civic duty, of pride in the accomplishments of preceding generations, and only then do they serve as the basis for bold theoretical generalizations and as a preventative against oversights, mistakes, and shortcomings.

The speaker noted that in the past the problem of evidence, of soundness, and of professionalism in historical research have been replaced by the more partial term "analysis," which is to forget that any analysis yields results only if it relies on evidence. Recently attention has begun to be drawn to the need to speak about the past not only seriously and judiciously, but also with proof in hand. Yet sometimes the other extreme also crops up: at times some historians look upon the soundness of a historical work exclusively as the need to draw upon source material which was previously difficult to gain access to and sometimes altogether out of reach.

S.L. Tikhvinskiy pointed to the unjustified limitations which have had a negative effect on the development of historical science. For instance, researchers studying the real problems of the culture and everyday life of the nationalities of our country have been deprived of the possibility of drawing upon the material of the USSR Central Statistical Administration and the statistical institutions of the union republics, on letters to the editors of newspapers on nationality problems, on information supplied to the USSR Supreme Soviet from the republics on the development of the social and cultural infrastructure. The opportunities for using material from party and government archives were restricted still more in the seventies and eighties. The archive documents of the Central Statistical Administration, the People's Commissariat of Finance, Gosplan, the USSR Council of People's Commissars, and other holdings have for all practical purposes been inaccessible for all of 20-30 years. As a consequence, in the 70th year of Soviet power Soviet researchers were deprived of the possibility of working freely with many archive holdings and even the press in the first years of the revolution. Restrictions of that kind were arbitrarily imposed on many archive materials on the history of the USSR in the pre-October period as well. Soviet historians are lagging even further

behind in their information about the state of world science, and opportunities have been cut back for researchers to work in foreign archives and book collections. The Institute for Scientific Information in the Social Sciences of the USSR Academy of Sciences, which possesses an automated information system on a number of fields, has still not turned toward historians, archeologists, and ethnographers.

The member-secretary reported that the Bureau of the History Department recently took a number of steps to make known to the appropriate departments the concern of the scientific community about the state of affairs that has now come about and the fact that it does not meet the requirements of the party with respect to the social sciences. Settlement of the question of furnishing sources of information for historical research has been moving slowly, even though some improvement has been observed. Just in the Central State Archives of the October Revolution, the highest agencies of government power, and the bodies for government administration of the USSR restrictions have been removed from about 292,000 items out of the 338,654 items to which access was restricted.

The speaker went on to discuss the problems of organizing and planning research. He noted that an oversimplified understanding of the topicality of historical research, which has been treated only as a study of the history of the present time, has become widespread. With the exception of the major research topics with priority, the topic plan for the rest of the projects has to a considerable degree been shaped haphazardly, under the influence of the particular interests of researchers, which in turn have quite often been based on the principle of the smallest inputs of intellectual energy and have been far from the main line problems of historical science. Sooner or later upon completion of work of this kind this defective practice has come to the surface, has resulted in creation of a "publishing portfolio" that has not been realized for many years, and has caused the number of sheets printed to be below what it should have been.

Systematic, creative, and mutually enriching contacts have been lacking with VUZ historians, economists, philosophers, literary experts, creative unions, and researchers from the republics. A majority of the scientific councils of the department have also been performing their coordinating functions inadequately, and this has been reflected in the state of historical science at the local level, prevented the possibility of providing the proper assessment and resistance to revivals of nationalism in treating the past of the nationalities of the USSR, and impeded the growth and upbringing of national cadres of historians.

S.L. Tikhvinskiy paid particular attention to the personnel problems of Soviet historical science. To a considerable extent the personnel potential of the main institutes has been haphazard, the staffing of the various directions

and disciplines and specialization have been "with the naked eye," and the "scarce" specialties and "dying" directions have not been promptly strengthened with young researchers. The Institute for the History of the USSR of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in spite of repeated reminders from the department's bureau, has so far not furnished qualified personnel for the sector called upon to promote development of the science of history in the republics and to concern itself with the history of ethnic relations.

In most institutes the work of the graduate program has in recent years not been taken up in their scientific councils. The practical effect in this area of the Commission for Work With Young People (director—A. Derevyanko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences), created 3 years ago under the department's bureau, has been minimal. The institutes of the department have proven to be ill prepared for the new personnel policy proclaimed by the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. For carrying out the planned replacement of the supervisory echelon of historical science, beginning with sector chiefs and ending with institute directors, in accordance with the greater restrictions noted, there are extremely few members of the academy and doctors of science who are suitable for this purpose who have not achieved the maximum age for taking administrative positions and who are capable of scientific and organizational work; nor is there a large group of promising young candidates of sciences.

A psychology of complacency, which stands in the way of boldness and originality of scientific thought, which has resulted in excessive caution, playing it safe, a reluctance to use such an important instrument for development of science as creative discussion, has taken shape in some historians, above all those at the supervisory level. At the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee the party, talking about the reasons for negative phenomena in the life of Soviet society, was very frank in naming the entire group of them, including the failure of the CPSU Central Committee itself to react in good time to the need for change. This devotion to principle and honesty must be an example for all Soviet historians. From this standpoint the speaker critically examined the results of the work of the bureau of the Department of History of the USSR Academy of Sciences and emphasized that the work of the department itself is in need of restructuring. It has to be admitted that on the part of the members of the department an insufficiently responsible attitude has sometimes been taken toward the decisions of the bureau arrived at collectively.

There have been serious complaints about the leadership of the institutes of the department. The absence of a sufficiently flexible structure and mobility in moving personnel around has in a number of institutes stood as a substantial obstacle to being responsive in performing urgent assignments not included in the plan. Performance of such assignments has been a pure formality,

uncreative in nature, and has been replaced by enumeration of what has been done or what has been planned. To be specific, entire scientific directions in world history, which in the past were well-known for their schools—Germanic specialists, Scandinavian specialists, specialists in the history of France, and others—have recently lost the positions they once had. Now in the World History Institute of USSR Academy of Sciences the directorate has undertaken to coordinate an revive the country-oriented fields and has examined the work of yearbooks on the history of individual countries, which have suffered a disastrous loss of both prestige and circulation in recent years.

In a number of our institutes things have not been as they should be with planning and reporting, and a tendency to self-isolation from the department and from other institutes has been observed. Certain scientific councils of the department report on themselves only when the plan of international and all-union measures is being made up; in spite of the repeated recommendations of the department's bureau, they still have not become centers for preparing comprehensive programs and report-forecasts, and they have deliberately evaded the drafting of the most important lines of historical research over the long run in their particular field.

The speaker covered certain results of the certification and conversion of scientific personnel to the new system of remuneration, reporting that a decree to that effect had been adopted by the department's bureau on this matter in which it noted the elements of formalism, the absence of sufficient openness related to certification, the vagueness and diversity of the criteria used to judge whether scientific associates in the institutions of the department are fit for their duties. The leaders of the institutes have in this connection been ordered to analyze in every aspect the results of the certification and to share experience in conducting certification in the pages of scientific journals.

According to the speaker's assessment, perestroika in Soviet historical science has reached a point where in addition to impartial criticism of shortcomings and errors and self-criticism, there is also a need for constructive recommendations and specific acts. He reported that in the fall of 1986 the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences carried out a substantial effort to evaluate the state of Soviet historical science, summarized a large body of critical suggestions, arguments, and proposals contained not only in the notes of the members of the department and associates of institutes, but also in the letters of workers.

Completion of work on the drafts of six long-range programs of the department was an important landmark in the process of perestroika. They were repeatedly discussed in the department's bureau, and they will be published in the journals of the department along with an introductory article from the department's bureau.

The Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences has ordered the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences to prepare the following report-forecasts: "Theory of the World Historical Process," "History of the Construction of Socialist Society," "History of the World Revolutionary and Liberation Process," "History of the Foreign Policy of the USSR and International Relations," "Ethnic History and Present-Day Ethnic Processes," "History of the Formation and Development of a Multinational State—The USSR," "Historical Lines of Development of the Nationalities of Asia, Africa, and Latin America," "History of the Culture of the Russian and Other Nationalities of the USSR," "History of World Culture," and "The Role of Religions in the Past and in the Contemporary World." These forecasts were prepared on time. But they need to be cleared with the republic institutions and VUZ's and with the other departments of the Social Sciences Section of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

The speaker called for the forecasts and multiannual programs to unite the efforts of the historians of the entire country in solving the most promising and crucial tasks of historical science so that they figure as the foundation for planning research work in all our institutes and VUZ departments.

A number of scientific papers were heard on relevant topics in sessions of the department's bureau during the reporting period. Their discussion was very worthwhile and drew attention to the study of a number of relevant directions in historical science. But the influence of the department's bureau cannot be restricted to hearing and discussing individual papers. The bureau should return more decisively to the fundamental problems of science and discuss major ideas and works. There is a need in the very near future to carry out the old recommendations on examining in the bureau the conceptions of the most important collective works, for example, works such as the "History of Europe." A number of research projects which have already come out, both individual and collective, concerning the key problems of science, should also be discussed.

The tradition of holding sessions of the department's bureau in the field in order to hear reports of the directorates of institutes right in their scientific councils should be revived so that the opinions concerning scientific directions and the work of the institute as a whole can be exchanged in the most democratic way.

A number of measures have been taken to carry out the decision of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences concerning the report delivered by the History Department in the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, the most important of which was the Coordinating Conference of Heads of the Country's Institutions in the Field of History, which was held in June 1986.

The conference took place in a spirit of criticism and self-criticism, and detailed recommendations were adopted at it: in particular, a recommendation to create a coordinating council under the department; certain ideas for improving coordination of scientific research issued by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences following the October General meeting, were even anticipated. At this point some of the recommendations set forth in the coordinating conference have been carried out.

The development of Soviet historical science, S.L. Tikhvinskiy said, depends to a decisive degree on how successful its untapped potential is utilized by means of such instruments as criticism, self-criticism, glasnost, and democratization of the scientific process. Appeals for discussion of issues settled long ago by science are an unacceptable approach to criticism and discussions from the positions of an unsubstantiated denial of everything that has been done in studying history in the seventies and eighties, just as it is intolerable to be overattached to the old and outdated, to what has not been confirmed in social practice, and to renounce the truthful admission of past mistakes and errors. Criticism and discussions are the means of understanding and applying Marxism-Leninism and of penetrating to its essence.

The journals and scientific councils of the department are called upon to become centers of criticism and discussion of controversial problems along with the institutes. The process of the further democratization of the life of Soviet historical science must begin above all in these units. It is indispensable to periodically renew the membership of editorial collegiums and scientific councils. New, bold, and conclusive ideas must be presented and conceptual foundations of historical works discussed and hammered out in the pages of journals, in sessions of editorial collegiums, scientific councils, and learned councils of institutes in a context of broad glasnost and comradely discussion.

As the quality and return to society of historical works steadily increases, there is an indispensable need at the same time to seek out new forms for carrying them out. Not only should an appeal be made on this matter to the publishing house "Nauka," but other means should be used as well. There is a need to set up under the History Department a strong facility of equipment for speedy printing, to obtain permission of the USSR Goskomizdat to publish monographs on an offset duplicator, and to arrange a broad system for preliminary information and the sale of offset-printed publications. The department's bureau has taken a number of real steps in this regard. Although slowly, the question is being settled of creating a joint offset printing section in the department; the question has been raised with the authorities of permission for publishing monograph research papers on history with speedy offset printing equipment.

The decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, the speaker emphasized, demand that the most fixed attention be turned to solving personnel problems. Reducing the age of supervisory personnel must not be turned into a campaign, all hasty solutions on this matter can cause irreparable harm. It is recommended that the leadership of institutes analyze carefully the personnel available for promotion, setting as the criteria for inclusion in this pool the candidate's professional level and businesslike, political, and moral attributes. Although with the exception of directors, deputy directors, and learned secretaries of institutes, scientific-administrative personnel are not on the organization chart of the department under the draft of the institute's new bylaws, it would be advisable for this pool to be examined in the department's bureau as well and to discuss the entire situation with the scientific-administrative personnel of historians in the department's institutes. It would be wise to set up under the department's bureau a commission for personnel development that would consist of members of the department. The commission would be called upon to analyze the personnel situation and to work out recommendations for a 30-percent annual rejuvenation of the scientific personnel of the institutes and to examine the problematical situations which inevitably arise in this connection.

The speaker said that the certification of scientific personnel conducted in 1986 was not a one-time measure, but an ongoing process. There is no question that it had a constructive impact on the scientific climate and morale in the collectives, but at the same time the institutes were unable to use it to altogether free themselves of "scientific ballast." The stimulative impact of certification on intensification of scientific work is so far negligible; many aspects of its procedure require refinement, above all with respect to further democratization of the work of certification commissions in the light of the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

There has to be a radical invigoration of the work of the commissions of the department for relations with secondary and higher education and for problems of young people so as to screen talented scientists in a planned way and to prepare them for their scientific work from the time they are students. The organization of mobile research subdivisions within the framework of the institutes requires a great deal of attention on the part of the leadership and party and trade union organizations of the institutes. At the same time, it has to be admitted that creation of flexible institute structures is not a one-time measure, but a long-range strategy. This effort cannot be allowed to become a formality. It is important that none of the structural changes be hasty and that forms that have justified themselves and collectives that have taken shape and are performing well not be destroyed.

The member-secretary dwelled on the problem of replenishing the staff of the History Department of the USSR

Academy of Sciences and said that it was indispensable to strengthen it with major scientists who have experience and interest in scientific administration. The department's bureau must thoroughly examine the question of distribution of vacancies among specializations and make an effort to discover worthy candidates for election as members and corresponding members of the academy above all from among young and promising doctors of science and show unanimity in electing those who are most worthy. The department has a great deal of work ahead of it in carrying out measures related to the perestroika taking place throughout the entire system of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The principal measure in this group is the transfer of responsibility for strategy in developing scientific directions to the department.

The speaker expressed the opinion that the specific nature of historical science has not been appreciated when the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences dealt with such matters as definition of the organization chart of the staff of the department, the distribution of financial appropriations for maintaining scientific relations with the socialist and capitalist countries. The distribution of personnel and financial resources must be adjusted so as to take into account the specific nature and needs of historical science. In connection with the broadening of the responsibilities of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and its assumption of the functions of material-and-technical and financial support of historical science, these matters must be constantly at the center of attention. Meanwhile a great number of them have accumulated, and they are holding back the development of science. A majority of the history institutes have been experiencing an acute shortage of space, they have not been furnished adequate printing facilities, especially equipment for rapid printing. Inclusion of the position of deputy member-secretary for scientific-administrative affairs in the organization chart of the department's staff (V.A. Kumanev, doctor of historical sciences, has been approved for that position by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences) will undoubtedly help in dealing with these matters.

S.L. Tikhvinskiy said in conclusion at the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee a most serious demand that words and plans be backed up with real deeds and with a further and accelerated restructuring of effort.

The participants in discussion of the address included members of the academy B.A. Rybakov, V.A. Vinogradov, A.L. Narochitskiy, I.I. Mints, Yu.V. Bromley, A.M. Samsonov, and M.P. Kim, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences P.V. Volobuyev, K.V. Chistov, and N.N. Dikov, M.S. Kapitsa, doctor of historical sciences, and G.V. Klokova, candidate of pedagogical sciences.

In summing up the results of the discussion, S.L. Tikhvinskiy called for an invigoration of the work of historical scientists and gave an assurance that the leadership of the History Department of the USSR Academy

of Sciences would examine most carefully the critical remarks and recommendations expressed by members of the department concerning improvement of material and technical supply of scientific activity, identification of the priority lines of research, and organization of creative relations with higher and secondary education. In the light of the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, he said, greater attention would be paid to certification and to personnel development so that the perestroika taking place in the system of the scientific research institutions of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences would gain momentum. This must not involve either gerontophagy or neglect of the question of promoting talented young people, nor lowering requirements as to the level of performance. S.L. Tikhvinskiy particularly emphasized the urgent need to organize fruitful scientific discussions and to strengthen the educative role of historical science.

The general meeting of the department adopted a decree entitled "On the Paramount Issues of Restructuring the Work of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences in the Light of the Decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee."

The decree specifically noted that the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee marked a new frontier in pursuing the party's strategic course toward acceleration of the socioeconomic development of Soviet society, renewal of all aspects of the country's life, and the shaping of new political thinking. The party is leading the country toward a qualitatively new and essentially revolutionary stage of development. The need for it and its justification have been confirmed by a theoretical analysis that is impressive in its profundity and by a precise identification of the problems that have come to a head and ways of solving them.

The decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, the decree of the CPSU Central Committee entitled "On the Journal *Kommunist*," the addresses of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the address which Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered at the All-Union Conference of Heads of Social Science Departments have given a powerful impetus to development of historical science. In recent months a definite effort has been made by the History Department to act on the critical suggestions, instructions, and recommendations contained in those materials. But the pace of restructuring the activity of Soviet historians does not yet fully meet the requirements of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. There is a need for purposive, consistent, and concrete effort able to guarantee the emergence of thoroughly substantiated major scientific ideas, scientific directions, fundamental publications that have new scientific quality and political and social impact, which require constant improvement of the present forms and methods for administration of the process of scientific research and introduction

of promising new ones, improvement of the preparation, training, and assignment of scientists, recruitment of young creative forces into the leadership of historical science, and widespread development of fruitful discussions on the current problems of history.

The general meeting of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences decreed that the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee are to be taken as fundamental for the activity of all institutions of the History Department, imposing on all scientific collectives and every historical scientist the obligation to do everything to promote their realization through practical action. One of the most important tasks in restructuring the work of Soviet historians is deemed to be a decisive rise in the scientific level of historical research and the creative use of the dialectical method of cognition and generalization, which is based on the socialist law of truth. The decree adopted put an obligation on scientific institutes, journals, and scientific councils of the department and on the department's members to take an active part in preparing and conducting the planned conferences of social scientists.

It was recommended that the department's institutes revise by July 1987 scientific research plans to bring them into conformity with the recommendations of report-forecasts, paying attention to shortening the time required to work on existing topics and the new ones included and also to guaranteeing that the work is done on them using flexible and temporary scientific collectives. The department's bureau was called upon during 1987 to examine the conceptions of the most important summary research being conducted in the department's institutes.

It was deemed indispensable during 1987 to hold joint sessions of the department's bureau with representatives of the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and the country's leading scientific centers on problems of strengthening relations among academy science, VUZ science, and sector science. During 1987 the department's bureau will be putting order in the network of scientific councils, commissions, committees, societies, and associations affiliated with the department, it will create a commission for personnel development one of whose paramount tasks will be to analyze and monitor posts in scientific administration that become vacant with a view to filling them with young personnel from among recognized scientists capable of work in scientific administration. Examination of the various aspects of distribution of vacancies among specializations in accordance with the upcoming 1987 elections to the USSR Academy of Sciences and the discovery of candidates for election to membership in the History Department in accordance with the requirements of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee has been outlined for the department's bureau.

The department's institutes, the decree states, must by 1 May 1987 submit to the department's bureau recommendations on the status, functional procedure, and material incentives of flexible ad hoc interdivision (intersector) and interinstitute (under the History Department) creative groups, especially made up of young researchers.

The National Committee of Historians of the Soviet Union has been called upon to hold in June 1987 an international scientific conference in Moscow on the topic "Ideas of Peace in History and the Present Time" and to prepare recommendations on creating a public organization "Historians for Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat."

It was also deemed indispensable to activate in every way the effort to prepare for celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The decree called upon the journals of the department to see to the publication of articles devoted to the tasks of Soviet historical science in the light of the decisions of the January (1987) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee.

#### Footnotes

1. *Kommunist*, No 4, 1987, p 24.

2. *Pravda*, 11 February 1987.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Nauka", "Novaya i novyeshaya istoriya", 1987

07045

#### Centenary of Musavat Diplomat, Writer Marked

18310418a [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 11 September 1987 carries on page 6 a 1600-word article by Vilayat Guliyev marking the 100th anniversary of the birth of Yusif Vazir Chamanzaminli; the article is headlined "Nobody Can Deny That...." Vazir was born in Shusha in a family of intellectuals, studied in Shusha and Tashkent, and graduated from the Kiev University law school. He then embarked on both a literary and diplomatic career. In 1919 he was named ambassador to Turkey by the independent Azeri Musavat government. With the Soviet takeover of Azerbaijan in 1920, Vazir joined the emigration in France. Guliyev claims that Vazir was not, as

supposed, involved with the Panturkist movement. He returned to the Soviet Union in 1926. Guliyev points out that "he never betrayed his ideals or compromised with his conscience."

/12232

#### Lost Works of Chamanzaminli Noted

18310418b [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 22 September 1987 carries on page 3 a 1300-word article by Kamran Mammadov highlighting the career of the writer Yusif Vazir Chamanzaminli on the occasion of the centenary of his birth; the article is headlined "A Realist Artist." He notes that the author "had a vast creative plan. He had the idea of writing a 40-year (1900-1940) history of the Azeri people in the form of novels. He had even noted the titles of this five-volume work: 'Conflicts,' 'Students,' 'In 1917,' 'Abroad,' and 'Tartar.'" Only two of the works, "Students" and "In 1917" appeared. It is added that "with the novel 'Abroad' he wanted to show the life and the pessimistic, unfortunate mentality and atmosphere among the Azeri intelligentsia in the emigration after the victory of the October revolution." In "Tartar" he wished to show the "new life" in Azerbaijan after the Soviet takeover. The author mentions that Chamanzaminli died in 1943 "in exile."

/12232

#### Study, Rehabilitation of Azeri Cultural Figures Urged

18310418c [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 18 September 1987 carries on pp 1, 6 a 2100-word article by Nizamaddin Shamsizade headlined "An Overture on the Forgotten" urging that studies of the origins of the modern Azeri literary culture include earlier artists from the bourgeois period (up to 1920 and beyond). An editorial introduction states that "restructuring is the rebuilding of an historical concept and aesthetic-philosophical view of our past in relation to our literary-cultural heritage. Without this, reviving a lively, sincere dialogue with yesterday's assumptions and that which we have forgotten and returning these to their legitimate places in our social and political thought is impossible." Discussing achievements of the period 1905-1907, the article points out that "we have adopted a stance of historical vagueness in relation to our culture in order to maintain 'political vigilance.'" A lengthy list of the names of cultural luminaries whose work needs reevaluation is given.

/12232

**Weak Propaganda Promotes Rise in Tajik Religious Activity**

18340408 Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik  
17 Jul 87 p 4

[Article by R. Abdulloyev]

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTONI SOVETI in Tajik on 17 July 1987 carries on page 2 a 1400-word article, "With Both Heart and Mind", by R. Abdulloyev, a reporter for KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, N. Yodgori, a reporter for TOJIKISTONI SOVETI, and B. Mingiyorov, a reporter for SOVET TOJIKISTONI. The article is subtitled, "Notes from the Plenum of the Kulyab Oblast Party Committee."

Weak educational work is the reason for the existence of the "spirit of nationalism," which still aids "localism, the selection of cadres on the basis of region, [and] protectionism..." Internationalist education among the young "is not good." Some students at pedagogical and medical schools cannot name the Union republics and their capitals. When new teachers begin work they do not engage in ideological activities and cannot fulfill their role in the children's upbringing. "Does not the fact that some of the oblast's young people studying in other cities participate in or lead fights demonstrate the weakness of educational work?"

There are "serious shortcomings" in atheist education. In recent years, confidence and nonchalance has led to the opinion among "many" communists that religion is harmless. As a consequence the clergy raised its head. The observance of religious rites and clerical influence on the young both increased. The mosques are full of religious holidays. The former reader of the khutba at the Kulyab mosque, Kh. Sharifov, preached that his audience knew about the problems of other peoples but not about their neighbors' problems and that they give for the well-being of society but not for their neighbors. According to the article, the remarkable thing about this was that no one dared explain the real meaning of Sharifov's statements, namely, that people should not be involved in social activities and that the "neighbors" to whom he referred were actually mullahs. Under his influence, mullahs' preaching at funerals increased. The center of these sermons violate communist law and morality.

In recent years there have appeared more itinerant mullahs in three of the oblast's rayons (Kulyab, Khovaling, and Dangara) They preach and use recordings and videotapes. They exploit the believers' ignorance. Their every deed violates the law. No ideological or law enforcement personnel dare stop this. One mullah, ascribed Marza's words to Muhammad.

The teachers in middle school No 4 in Khovalingskiy Rayon did not respond to that. On test days, many people, mostly students, make a pilgrimage to Hamadoni's tomb and ask God for a grade of 3. The next day,

they will be silent when the mullahs preach. The day after, some of them will go to a mosque, like the Kulyab teacher T. Fakhriddinov. The article asks, "What do our children learn, from which teacher?" The number of these mullahs, people who make pilgrimages, and holy places "is growing like mushrooms after the rain..."

The article states that Hamadoni's tomb remains a pilgrimage site even though there is now a museum on the spot. On holy days the museum staff admitted pilgrims. There was an article about this a year ago in KULYABSKAYA PRAVDA but the situation at the tomb has not improved. The museum staff now sells admission tickets to pilgrims who come on holy days. That means that henceforth they can pay to pray openly.

There are numerous folk healers in "every rayon" in the oblast. The article makes the point that they cannot really cure anyone and that a sick person can end up worse off. Not one folk healer has been held accountable for his activities.

The characteristics of atheist propaganda in Kulyab are timidity, inattentiveness to ideological duty, formalism, and the weakness of social and state organs. No one wants to work on this so-called "secret" subject. Local party, soviet, and social organizations just record the facts of the growing Islamic activity, punish individuals, and make resolutions, most of which exist solely on paper. There is no daily explanatory work with individual believers. Recently, believers in three villages in Leningraadskiy Rayon petitioned to open a mosque. The rayon ispolkom avoided responding because it did not want to take responsibility and passed the matter to higher authorities. Such silence is to blame for the increased activity of itinerant mullahs and increased religious observance. The article criticizes the superficial efforts of party committees to organize ideological activities as part of atheist propaganda. Only a few of the 200 lecturers and propagandists in the field of atheism are genuinely active.

In the past 2 years 190 people studied in the faculty of atheism at the night university of Marxism-Leninism and the 2-year school for atheist lecturers. However 80 percent of them are not engaged in atheist work. The authors contend that the aim was simply to make the numbers look good. The party found out that some of the students from Kulyab, Khovaling, and Dangara who attended the 2-year atheist lecturer school did not know where or what they were sent to study. The article says that a question wisely stated at the plenum was, "Whom are we fooling?" The propaganda and agitation department, the party committees at the rayon and oblast levels, and the first secretaries do not have enough information on the religious situation.

### **Afghan Muslim Affairs Minister Visits Baku**

18310417a [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST on page 3 a 500-word Azerinform report headlined "On the Basis of Neighborliness and Cooperation" on the visit to Baku of Abdul Jamil Zarifi, minister of Islamic affairs from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, at the invitation of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of the Transcaucasus. He said in an interview that "recently an agreement was signed between the DRA Ministry of Muslim affairs and Muslim organizations of the USSR. The respected Sheykhul-Islam A. Pashazade signed it in the name of Soviet Muslims. Under this agreement we are supplying printed materials to each other, exchanging clergy, and pursuing other types of relations. For example, my coming to Baku is based on one of the articles of this agreement."

/12232

### **Religious Traditions Survive in Schools**

18310417b [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI on 11 September 1987 carries on page 2 a 700-word article by Hamid Hajyyev, methodologist in the teaching methodology office of the AzSSR Ministry of Education, headlined "Scientific-Atheistic Education of Students." He points out that "repulsing bourgeois propaganda on time and establishing youth's political vigilance towards hostile ideology must be at the center of attention of both school and teacher as one of the important questions of the day." However, "at a time when religious miracles and fraudulent swindlers are being exposed, one also comes across directors, teachers, and educators representing religious influences which take pride in the past and call themselves 'seyid' and 'akhund' [religious, primarily Shi'ite titles] in the schools. It is pointless to discuss the scientific-atheistic education conducted in such schools in Sabirabad, Zhdanov, Imishli, Salyan, Saatly, Neftchala, and others."

/12232



## **PRAVDA Reviews Film on Controversial Director Yefremov**

18000028a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 87p 6

[Article by Konstantin Shcherbakov: "Conflict"; "Un-Birthday Notes"]

[Text] The film is called "*There Must Be a Theater*," but it could have been called "*Conflict*." You will agree that for an anniversary film it is a strange one. Moreover, no celebration takes place on the screen either, except for the fact that the showing of the tape to the TV audience was dedicated to Oleg Nikolayevich Yefremov, and happened to fall on his 60th birthday.

The plot of the motion picture is a sharp and agonizing confrontation within the Moscow Arts Theater [MKhAT], the end result of which was its splitting up. The idea is Yefremov's and that is also the source of the conflict. Well, one may ask, why should Aleksandr Svobodin, author of the screenplay, and producer-director Marina Goldovskaya have focused attention precisely on this instance in Yefremov's biography? Were there really so few roles played and performances given—famous and celebrated ones—that would have provided fascinating stories? And here they show rehearsals of the not-yet-released "*Perlamutrova, Zinaida*" by Mikhail Roshchin—rehearsals which incidentally aren't going very well, because both the producer of the play and the actors are too wrapped up in the internal drama of the theater. And the attempts to present the arguments of not only those on Yefremov's side, but those of his opponents as well, and with them, the opponents, omit crucial points.

However, we shall ask another question as well, and in the given situation it is no doubt the root, fundamental question: For what reason did Yefremov, on the eve of his 60th birthday, when he could have quietly awaited the honors and regalia, have to get involved in this story about the split, the outcome of which could hardly have been predetermined and known beforehand?

Svobodin and Goldovskaya could surely have made a good-quality, favorable film about the master when he was at the height of his fame. But that would not have been a film about Yefremov.

For his life has been a series of conflicts starting with his very earliest days in the theater. The establishment of "*Sovremennik*" was an unprecedented, captivating conflict, which went on for several years until the theater was officially recognized and made legitimate; the production and showing to the public of "*Bolshevik*" by Mikhail Shatrov, when the performance—one of the greatest achievements of epic historical-revolutionary art—ran for nearly six months without the appropriate authorizations required; his departure from "*Sovremennik*," which was the result of its sudden growth out in the open and its collapse owing to mutual misunderstanding among those who formerly held the same views, where it

seemed that they would forever be in agreement; and the beginning of Yefremov's "MKhAT" era—the initial results of which were depressing, when even Viktor Sergeyevich Rozov (who speaks of this in the film) did not believe that anything sensible would result from it. And then there was a new and severe increase in tensions with the controlling authorities in connection with the performance of "*Tak pobedim!*" [Thus We Shall Win!], by the very same Mikhail Shatrov who was subsequently awarded the State Prize as a result—an increase in tensions when it was as if everything had finally quieted down and smoothed out. And then now there is this noisy, serious split—at the very time when it seemed beyond doubt that everything had quieted down and smoothed out once and for all...

I have no intention of discussing the latest events here; enough has been said about that in the press. And I do not aspire to enumerate all of Yefremov's conflict situations—that would take up too much space. I would only like to say that in each of them, Yefremov's fierce persistence began with his profound sense of civic duty, with his noble faith in the theatrical and social ideals which inspired him in his youth. And had it not been for that fierce persistence—who knows, perhaps certain significant objectives in our artistic movement would have remained untaken, and unconquered. And it is even more important to note that each time, Yefremov came out the victor.

Galina Volchek says in the film that she had always known how the next conflict would come out, for Yefremov was born a winner. But the film shows convincingly what that cost; how much effort, talent, and spiritual courage was expended on those victories!

The screen narrative blended in excerpts from the films in which Yefremov played—basically older works, from those times when he was becoming one of the favorite actors of our generation. We were all young once—but how young he was! (Although in chronological terms he was somewhat older than us). That open, somehow all-penetrating smile of Yefremov's—the smile of a man who believes in life and calls upon us to believe with the all-embracing magnetism of his personal charm. Oh, times were not so simple then; we had to struggle for success; but still, those were golden times, golden... Another film clip—and there is Yefremov before us today, or more precisely yesterday—on the eve of the recent events which were to decide the fate of MKhAT. An immeasurably weary face; bags under his eyes—and the eyes themselves: as if they are wounded and at the same time uncompromising. But not a single one of his victories was for nothing: each of them left its indelible traces on the face of the artist.

And here is Tatyana Doronina at the podium, one of his principal opponents at MKhAT, and once again a film clip: the cast of the film "*Tri topolya na Plyushchikhe*" ["Three Poplars in the Ivy"], and the most penetrating moment of human bonding, in the unforgettable duet of

Yefremov and Doronina. That's the way it was. But now? "*Gruba zhizn!*" ["It's a Tough Life"]—recalling the words from Chekhov's "*Chaika*" ["The Seagull"], one of Yefremov's finest performances on the stage at MKhAT. And yet again, the weary face of the master, and his uncompromising and wounded eyes. You know... No, that is not the face of a victor over nature by divine grace. But it is the face of a man who will never, under no circumstances whatever, retreat from that in which he believes.

"He is tough, sometimes even cruel," Viktor Sergeyevich Rozov says of him. As Igor Kvasha said, in essence, "He was always one of us, but absolutely his own man, and he was a peremptory leader." The feelings coincide. Truly he was one of us, one of our generation and a representative and spokesman for it. And nonetheless I've personally always sensed a distance which I could not overcome. He did not establish this distance, not under any circumstances—he always was and remains a complete democrat. But his personality exudes some kind of magnetism, of one who is in first place, of leadership, wherein one has the constant feeling that he is capable of doing—and does—more than others. And as far as cruelty is concerned, what of it? I've had the occasion to see Yefremov's cruelty too—when the work, without which he cannot conceive of existing, was subjected to the danger of extinction. But what if you leave the theater in this crisis situation? Such is approximately the question that is also heard from the screen. Yefremov is thinking before our eyes, just as if he is considering the possibilities. Truly—what if I leave? Should I focus my efforts on, for example, the work of the Theater Actors' Guild? No, I cannot leave; I must get what is mine; I must struggle. This—is Yefremov. How can he leave? Can one stop being oneself?

Aleksandr Kalyagin and Oleg Borisov crowd into the room during the short breaks between rehearsals of "*Perlamutrova, Zinaida*." From their words one can understand immediately how poorly the rehearsals are going—at times Yefremov grabs and cajoles the actors, and at times he appears dispirited; and these impressions are also communicated to the actors. But a man is not without his limits—even such a strong person as the current director of MKhAT. But bearing in mind everything about his leadership abilities and about his strength, which lies in the joyful assurance that old Yefremov will somehow of course win, and will be able to cope; one must also bear in mind that one must take care of the people who are able to take—and do take—upon their shoulders that which another is unable to do no matter how hard he tries.

Now and then one thinks of how much of his art Yefremov failed to give, how much he failed to realize his own talents—as an actor above all; how many roles he has not played, as he could have played like no one else... It's true, after all, that an endless amount of time has gone to the struggle, to the defense of his theatrical cause; and his strength, which can never be returned. He

would explode, and at times he would be nasty, when he wanted to be tender. But if... If he had not possessed such a fiery, all-absorbing temperament of a fighter—perhaps Yefremov's best artistic creations would not have come to pass. And if it had not been for these conflicts, connected with the defense of the foremost art of his times—perhaps we would have known a different Yefremov, one who might have been much less prominent as an actor and director. And would such celebrated "veterans" of MKhAT as Angelina Iosifovna Stepanova and Mark Isaakovich Prudkin not love him with love that is old and true, and would they not speak out resolutely on his behalf in his most complex, crucial moments? With all of his internal contradictions, Yefremov is too much of an integral person that one would be able to reckon that, well, if we take away such and such, then we can add such and such...

The film presents the cast from the film by Aleksandr Mitty, "*Gori, gori, moya zvezda*" ["The Mountains, the Mountains, and my Star"], in which Yefremov plays the artist Fedya. And we hear the trembling, catching voice of Oleg Tabakov, who played the role of Iskremas, the main hero of the film: "I thought you were a house painter, but you are, it seems, an artist..." And the tears in the happy eyes of Fedya, and the stamp of inspiration on his then still-young face. Every new encounter with Oleg Yefremov strikingly and happily reveals him to us anew—as an artist and as a man.

09006

**Documentary Film Breaking Away from  
Bureaucratic Mold**

*18000028b Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 11 Oct 87 p 3*

[Article by V. Kuzin, director, Leningrad Documentary Film Studio: "The Plan, or a Good Film?": "Once Again on Unresolved Problems in Documentary Films"]

[Text] "Is this the editorial staff of '*Lenkinokhroniki*'? I saw your film magazine yesterday. Please come right over; I have a subject for you."

Such phone calls come in constantly from plants, construction projects, kolkhozes and institutes. The studio's mail contains collective and individual reactions to documentary films; advice; criticism; suggestions. At creative encounters with documentary film makers, and in lines at movie theater ticket windows: "Aren't there any extra tickets?!"

It has not been like that for the last 20 years.

Documentary film is emerging from a state of crisis which lasted many long years. In my view the reason for the crisis lay not in the so-called "competition of television" or in the "poor work of the film lending service"—these were superficial reasons, and it was convenient to conceal the truth and our own shortcomings in this

manner. But if one calls a spade a spade, the essence of the crisis lay elsewhere, and deeper—in the deformation, or more precisely, in the distortion of Lenin's social principles for film commentary and as a result, loss of the "feedback" from the theater audience. We lost the mass audience (in spite of certain fine films) because we did not satisfy the needs and interests of the viewers. By dint of objective and quite often subjective reasons, documentary film makers had been providing minor services to the departmental needs of the bureaucratic system, and frequently what was shown on the screen was the desired rather than the actual situation. It was not for nothing that certain administrators believed that, "The movies can do anything!" and that people used to say, "It's just like in the movies."

Today the situation has changed considerably. Documentary film makers, casting off departmentalism, have shown that they are a most active task force of cinematographers, and have already done quite a lot to shape public consciousness in the spirit of perestroika. The sold-out houses which Yu. Podniyeks' film commentary "*Is it Easy to be Young?*" has been playing to in the country would earn the envy of any dramatic film maker. And a program of documentary films by A. Sokurov, created in our studios, has been successfully screened in the "Leningrad" Theater Center for several months in a row now. This year at the 20th Tbilisi Film Festival they have been showing a program of Leningrad documentary film makers: "*Opyty*" [Experiments] by V. Naumov, "*Elegiya*" [Elegy] by A. Sokurov, and "*Vstretimsya vo dvore*" [Let's Meet in the Courtyard] by Zh. Romanova, were judged the best.

Specialists know very well, and the audience can well imagine, that the creation of a film is a complicated process which has three equally important aspects: the ideological-artistic, the organizational-productive, and the technological. It is understood that perestroika can be successful if it is carried out in a comprehensive manner. But this is not yet happening! If we have managed to inject enthusiasm today, or as it is currently put, achieve a certain breakthrough in documentary films on the ideological-artistic level by means of the human factor, in the other two underlying principles a braking mechanism is acting on cinematography.

In film planning and production, the universally-condemned but still all-powerful "*His Highness, Val* [gross output]" continues to reign; at some time and by some kind of evil will, this attitude was voluntarily transferred from industry to films. The studio collectives are forced to focus all their efforts not on the ideological-artistic quality of the film, but on fulfilling the quantitative indicators: "Val," "Commodity," "Range of Goods, Profit." Films in their essential nature are individual-piecework products; in spite of this, however, a rigid conveyor-flow line system is in operation at the studios, just as if we were producing canned goods and not works of film commentary. A conveyor line, as is well-known,

can produce only consumer goods—"dull films." Therefore it is useless to criticize "dull films" as long as the existing film system is functioning.

Understanding all this, Goskino [State Committee for Cinematography] and the USSR Union of Cinema Workers have begun to repair the system: selectivity and glasnost have been introduced, and the rights of the studios have been expanded. But the system remains in place!

Is it real and not a trick of the projector? Of course it is—Yes of course! After the 5th Congress of Cinematographers in Bolshevo, business gaming sessions were held, and a so-called "Basic Model for Film Structuring" was worked out and adopted. In the course of the difficult and lengthy discussions, the Leningrad documentary film makers proposed an entire complex of specific measures, which lay at the basis of the "Transitional Model for Non-Dramatic Films," adopted by Goskino USSR at the 11th Plenum of the USSR Union of Cinematographers. The Transitional Model, while taking into consideration the specifications of the documentary film makers, differs significantly from the "Basic Model for the Cinematographer." Unlike the "cavalrymen" and the "merchants" we have not yet made it our goal to distinguish a creative studio from a movie factory; we are not placing special stress on profit and cost accounting; and we are not removing creative workers from the staff. Our main ideas are to eliminate the quantitative indicators, introduce two-year topical planning, actually expand the rights of the film studios, introduce full cost-accounting relationships with the clients on the basis of contracted prices, and so on. In brief, our program-minimum creates real production, financial and technical conditions for fruitful creativity and for access to the mass audience. The model for non-dramatic movies in the transitional period does not require material expenditures. Only one thing is necessary—rescinding the old instructions! However it is precisely this that is not being done: "Val" has not been abolished! Two-year topical planning has not been introduced! Relationships with the clients have not been changed! And the rights we received have been reduced. At Goskino USSR and at the Union of Cinema Workers they console us by saying, "Wait for the base model."

But one wants to ask, "Why wait?" There is the Transitional Model which, while not shattering the existing structure, makes it possible to work better and in a new manner. But having been unable to overcome the resistance from various departments to which the Model has gone "for coordination," they are evidently waiting for instructions "from above." Meanwhile the general situation is not getting any better.

The controlling organs are taking an active part in applying the brakes to the restructuring of documentary and dramatic films. One incompetent commission rushes in to replace another, in the rayon, the city, the republic, and so on. They inspect both in a planned,

comprehensive manner and selectively; and not for the purpose of improving matters, but—to establish guilt, to expose, to punish, to stifle initiative, and to defend obsolete instructions, and at times even to think up their own new ones...

The braking situation has given birth to an alarming trend among the documentary film makers themselves. Seeing that the "Transitional Model" is not being introduced, certain of our colleagues have decided to hurry up and introduce the "Basic Model" on the example of the gaming studios (principally "Mosfilm"). A pretext was found—a joint resolution was issued by Goskino USSR and the Union of Cinema Workers, which obligates the film studios to quickly present their five-year creative programs. "Self-financing creative studios," headed by an artistic administrator and a board, will be organized on the basis of these programs. Thus, beginning as early as next year, the existing documentary and popular-scientific film studios must be divided into a multitude of dwarf creative self-financing studios. In essence this is a revision of the resolution of the 11th Plenum of the USSR Union of Cinematographers, and a rejection of the transitional model for non-dramatic films.

Leapfrogging the "Transitional Model" and a "cavalry charge" to establish a self-financing creative studio—is this really not juvenile leftism! After all, perestroika means hard knowledge and objective economic conditions and respect for the objective organizational state of creative activity. Creative studios must **naturally** and organically grow out of the film studios which exist today, not by voluntaristic means. And purposeful programs are as necessary as air. It is good that the possibility to officially establish them has arrived at last. The collective of our own studio has been struggling to set up such programs for many years. Are the films of A. Sokurov really not a program? His film crews have always been collectives of people who think alike—in effect, a creative studio. But I am firmly convinced that one cannot create programs and creative studios by giving orders, even if the creative society gives its consent. The independence of the film studio must be respected!

In connection with the creation of self-financing creative studios, the idea has been expressed to eliminate film periodicals and to cut down production of films made on orders from ministries and departments. I'd like to ask the authors of these ideas—"the cavalrymen" about just one thing: "And what shall we live on, Comrades?" It's no secret that today there are not enough estimated appropriations for production of general screen films, and that films made on order and publicity films provide us our real economy. Or shall we transform film commentary into commercial film on the basis of our own wages and self financing?

Nor can I agree with the ever -increasing group of creative workers and film theoreticians who stubbornly declare that film periodicals are "remnants of the past."

Rather than improve our most effective weapon—film commentary—in a period of social development, it is proposed to replace film magazines with event films? What for? I know that many colleagues will angrily reject my answer: that steady remuneration even for the most vapid event film is ten times better than for the best magazine. Thus personal mercantile interest cuts off the branch—newsreels—on which documentary films have been sitting and continue to sit on throughout the world. We angrily expose poachers, who cut down centuries-old trees in the Siberian Taiga in order to quickly and rapaciously gather the nuts, and then with a clear conscience are doing the very same thing here in our own house. We forget about the chronicles which our cameramen maintain day in and day out at their stations; and we do not think about the future, about what our grandchildren will have to say about us.

Thus as one might expect, perestroika has uncovered a number of negative phenomena in the creative life of many studios. I have in mind those who understood democracy and glasnost as an opportunity to realize their own personal ambitions and group goals, and to implement the principle of anything-goes: creative freedom, for me; and social responsibility, for others. The young graduates of the Higher Scenario Courses display special agility (Forgive me, I couldn't think of a better word) in showering the editors of the Leningrad and other studios with orders on "urgent" topics, borrowed from today's popular magazines and newspapers. They hasten to fill in the "blank areas" in history and contemporary life with half-truths which, as is well-known, are often worse than lies. Afraid they will fall into the conservative category, or will not succeed in dividing up the "perestroika pie," the young conformists quite often support the "old timers." No doubt it is necessary to be daring, but only with two permanent conditions—with a high feeling of responsibility, and a clear comprehension of the fact that the truth cannot be one-sided; it is always multi-faceted, complex, and historically conditioned; and it demands competent analysis.

Evidently the collective of our studio, as others have, went through perestroika already in the years which have become known as the "period of stagnation." We struggled for it; we were beaten more than once; and we stacked up on the shelves the films which were then "unusable," with the firm conviction that truth will win out; and we produced problem films, of which we are today unashamed.

Today the main things are the quality of our films and film journalism: their ideological-artistic and professional level. The mass viewing audience can be won over only through good films. In order to do this, in my view, we must strive to get the higher authorities to actually implement the "Transitional Model of Non-Dramatic Films." And we must actively defend this model from attempts at revision; we must forbid both leftist leapfrogging and a "mercantilist" approach to film artistry—

which would merely compromise perestroika in the films. And that is what in essence my polemical remarks are addressed to.

Film studios must have production and creative independence! We must be the masters in our own house. Only then will the success of perestroika be assured, not in words but in deeds.

09006

**Moldavian Movie Industry Slow to Reform**  
*18000028c Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA*  
*in Russian 23 Oct 87 p 2*

[Article by Ye. Sobor, chairman, MSSR State Committee on Cinematography: "It's Time to Reset our Clocks"]

[Text] By virtue of my work I often have to meet with motion picture directors, writers, artists, actors and composers. The specific nature of the movies is such that without the "cooperation" of the Muse it's impossible to make a motion picture. An interesting detail: In our open, frank and at times impartial conversations about perestroika in the motion picture industry and other spheres of intellectual life, many of my interlocutors have tried to convince me that nearly all of the stagnation in the area of culture is the fault of those who control this sphere. This thesis was supported by quotations from various publications, press articles, and statements. They even go so far as to assert that once the bureaucratic obstacles are overcome, everything else will fall into place by itself. I'll tell you frankly that it's not the most pleasant feeling. One always feels one has been cast in the role of the defendant. But we need not be quite so severe. There are reasons for such accusations: in the arts, over the years, the burden has not always been borne in the best manner.

With time our meetings and arguments became more "peaceful" and constructive, and have all come down to "room temperature." The reason? Not one of those who felt that he was an "outcast" was able to name a single film and not a single film script by a Moldavian author (which in past years would have wound up in the cutting room floor), that has not been taken off the shelf and became an artistic discovery—under the present conditions of glasnost!

Having said that, however, under no circumstances should one come to the conclusion that the administration has erred. It was simply life itself, that which has occurred and which has been done over the past two years that has forced us—both the managers and the creative workers—to "reset our clocks," as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev so expressively put it: that is, judiciously take stock of our accumulated experience; cast off our mutual offenses; switch from reproach to joint, concrete matters; and look to the results.

Our documentary film makers have been working productively for the past two years. With all the means at their disposal they have been exposing hypocrisy and varnishing the truth; they have set about harmoniously (at times even scathingly) presenting on the screen the undesirable phenomena and negative aspects in the economy and social sphere of the republic. The titles of the films themselves—"How to Break the Vicious Circle?," "The Authority of Power and the Power of Authority," "Why Are You So Pensive, O Forest?," "With a Will and with Hope," "Where did the Drunkard Go?," "A House without a Cradle," "Who is the Master on the Sovkhoz?," "Lather," and "Indifference"—testify to the timeliness of the problems raised. Before the year is out further titles such as these will be added to the list.

At first glance motion pictures are in step with the times: the screen is criticizing the negative aspects of our lives at the crest, so to speak, of perestroika. But after all, frankly speaking, the newspapers and magazines today are more critical than our films. And you see, a motion picture is not a newspaper. Films must inherently possess, to a greater extent, both mastery of and an analytical approach to the phenomena of life, as well as breadth of view. One does not see this yet in many films. The regional review of the documentary films of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia and Moldavia held in Kishinev in September confirmed the modest nature of our achievements. The principal conclusion of the film critics is that the Moldavian documentary film makers were able to find only the outer layer; that is, that which is on the surface.

The question naturally arises: Are we not today committing another distortion in our work; have our documentary film makers not altogether taken the "warpath" with our reality? After all, the fact that negative phenomena have been poured out, so to speak, into the "pure water"—that's only a half-measure; no one is disputing the fact that negation is dialectically associated with affirmation. But nevertheless if we put only "the negative" on the screen, then, whether we want it or not, the audience will be filled with a sense of hopelessness and a lack of faith in the present day and toward perestroika. Obviously we must use the power of film commentary to try to vindicate, to advance, to bring to fruition the positive processes taking place in our society—the tasks facing everyone today, tomorrow, and in the future... "There are people in the world," asserted Aleksandr Blok, "who peer through the dark clouds and say: 'Spring is coming; the dawn is coming...' They are properly called artists."

What is needed is a mature, artistic analysis of the causes of the negative aspects of our life; what is needed is suggestions of ways to escape from them.

Apparently the time has come to "reset our clocks" with respect to the following question as well: What has the transitional period provided the administrators and the creative workers to strengthen their creative bond?

One can say without exaggeration that glasnost and democracy "in the most popular of the arts" has become not only a slogan, but reality as well. The interaction of the republic Goskino [State Committee for Cinematography] with the Union of Writers and Union of Cinematographers has evolved on a principally businesslike basis. The movies have been liberated from "secret patronage." Our approaches to the creative process today are identical: glasnost, without voluntarism and overadministration; and work not with the cinematographers "en masse" but with the specific individual. Such a line of conduct by the administration under conditions of glasnost is not established by decree and is not easy to work out. It appeared and was formulated as a result of the clash of positions, views and opinions.

At the root of these clashes was one and the same concern: When will the audience view the film-opening? In the search for the answer, you see, not only are the objective organizational prerequisites for restructuring cinematography of importance, but the subjective factors as well. Unfortunately, at present we do not have a surplus of talented works either. True, there is the first swallow—the film "Jona" by Valeriy Zhereg, which earned a prize at the Tbilisi Film Festival; however, as is well-known, one swallow does not make a summer. And meanwhile the audience is being shown, as in the "good old days," productions of "local" significance.

Time is needed, beyond a doubt: dramatic motion pictures are traditionally less mobile, and here, as is well-known, there is a gap of enormous dimensions between plans and accomplishments. It is gratifying that we have already found our first creative centers. In the future, there will be work on screening the works of K. Negrutsi, I. Drutse, I. Chobanu, N. Yesinenku, and V. Beshlyage; G. Malarchuk has already presented sharply critical scenarios dedicated to the problems of ecology in the republic; and E. Lotyanu, Ya. Burgiu, S. Saka and others are making their appearance as script writers.

It has been suggested to hold a scientific-practical conference early next year, dedicated to problems of the creative restructuring of Moldavian cinematography. I stress: creative. Instead of the usual reports, its participants—film critics, writers, and journalists—will be presented films created at the Moldova-Film Motion Picture Studios this year; their evaluation and their position in the overall motion picture process is the central question. There is also a "second plan," a second goal for this project: an open invitation for the public to analyze our affairs; further democratization, and glasnost. Without forestalling its results, I would like to stress that only after having passed such an examination will the creative workers be able to count on a climate of the "greatest possible favor" in the future...

Still another problem deserves out attention. Unfortunately not all creative workers—and yes, those who control the motion picture process as well—are willing to bow "under the pressure" of glasnost, not to mention

self-criticism. Despite our expectations, during the disputes and discussions at the meetings not one word was heard (nor did any appear in the pages of the newspapers and magazines) in "repentance"; nor did anyone admit that any film, scenario or book lacked substance. "The most important thing in literature at present," in the opinion of Academician D.S. Likhachev, "is repentance." It would not, I believe, be erroneous to assert that such repentance applies to us as well. If only because of the fact that during the years 1973-1986 at the film studios of Moldova-Film alone, scenes costing more than 130,000 rubles have been written off, and an absolute majority of the motion pictures of recent years have failed to reach the threshold of covering costs—17 million viewers. All of this bears witness to the fact that under conditions of perestroika it would seem that many of those who are feeling comfortable should be found among the "cadre" exposed to the rays of well-founded criticism. Above all, these are the authors and creators of "drabness."

The period of glasnost has not yet established a form capable of portraying the fate which has befallen creative works, and has not yet altogether gotten rid of "it-will-come-to-no-good-ism" and certain administrators of the motion picture making process. The interaction of the administrators and the creative workers does not in any way mean familiarity or flirtation; but neither are suspicion, lack of faith, and skepticism permissible here. There are also among the creative workers people for whom it would be actually advantageous to maintain a nervous state in the interaction between the colleagues and the administration. They are always the first to sign up for speeches at meetings and discussions and they try to reap profit from glasnost and democracy; but they do not have gifts for that and only pretend to have talent. One could name names here, but the fact of the matter is that these people, these "parroters of perestroika," are known to everyone in our sphere; their names are heard in the collectives more often than others, and their voices are constantly heard. They are familiar to us. I'm not sure that these lines will be to the liking of all of them: but I cannot but repeat them, because nihilistic "glasnost" can create nothing; it can only destroy. Here it is appropriate to cite the words of a certain thinker who asserts that "Votes must not only be counted; one must also weigh the fact, whose vote it is..."

The times have taught us still another lesson on "glasnost." We have democratically elected the director of a film studio and the artistic directors of the "Arta" creative-production association and of documentary film studios. But it turned out that glasnost and democracy can also be adapted "for personal ends," if that is advantageous to someone. Thus it happened that certain documentary film workers, forestalling events and bypassing the party bureau of their studio as well as their own Cinematographers' Union, hastened to elect "their own" artistic council; moreover, they were hardly guided by the business and creative qualities of their "chosen ones." Fortunately, these "champions" of democracy

were reproved by the collective itself. I can anticipate the unhappiness of those who disagree: "But that is suppression of glasnost!" And I respond, "glasnost" such as this does not stimulate creativity or nourish talent.

Democracy and glasnost in the arts should not lead to the triumph of mediocrity and "average" artists over talent. The time has come at last to decide who truly dedicates himself to motion pictures and who merely serves; who cultivates—in the words of K. Stanislavskiy—art in himself, and who cultivates himself in art.

We are far from thinking that all problems in restructuring the administration of the creative process have been eliminated—only the first steps in this direction have been taken, and a lot of long, hard work lies ahead. In particular, we have a lot of "blank spaces" in the matter of "linking up" the cinematographers and the administrators of the ministries and departments. In this respect the experience of the Georgians is interesting: every year meetings are held between the ministers, representatives of state committees, administrators of the state agro-industrial commission, and the members of the creative unions. These are not ostentatious accounting reports amid the thunder of applause and mutual compliments, but businesslike conversations on the most painful problems; here, in order to find a solution and work out a common—and sometimes new—viewpoint, the position of the bureaucracies encounters public opinion. Thus there will be fewer complaints and dilettantism. But among us, until now, administrators at this level try to maintain their distance from the creative workers, and they take criticism on the screen of the shortcomings of their sectors virtually as personal insults.

Indisputably, the Moldova-Film Studio is still in debt to its viewing audience. But as everyone knows, a retreating army cannot immediately cross over to the offensive. Even if the army is rearmed, there is a psychology of retreat among many of its soldiers, in their consciousness. Only a fresh reserve will restore an army to the march. For us this means not only training cadres at VGIK [All-Union Order of Labor Red Banner Institute of Cinematography] and the Higher Directors' Courses at Goskino USSR; or the opening of "*Debut*," the experimental young people's creative association—although these are also important—but also adopting measures to bring fresh, young cadres into the leading sectors of the studio, and arranging contacts with writers; and, perhaps the most important, democratization of the creative process.

The transitional period to the new model of cinematography has already started. One would like to believe that its finish will be fruitful as well.

### Conflicts of Leningrad Cultural Preservation Groups Deplored

18000037 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA  
PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 87p 3

[Article by I. Soboleva: "Rumors in the City. Straight Talk About Speculation on Different Values of Our Life"]

[Text] There are rumors going around the city. First one wave of rumors, and then another. Stupid, malicious, comical, mean — all kinds. And when one asks: Where are they coming from? — the same answers are given: the sister of a friend of my brother.

Recently rumors have been heard here and there, including rumors from entirely sensible people that there is a genuine conspiracy against Leningrad monuments, but the Society for the Preservation of Monuments, instead of coming to the defense of the monuments, not only has been inactive, but every year is wasting a half million rubles of our dues on the salaries of its associates, for prizes, and for other kinds of as yet unknown dark purposes.

All of that could be waved off as the usual gossip. What is disturbing this time, however, is the fact that the source of such information is specifically the group called "Salvation of Historic and Cultural Monuments."

The following is from a conversation with the deputy chairman of the Leningrad branch of the Society for the Preservation of Monuments, Lev Pavlovich Tikhonov. (This person is not at all just some administrator, but is also the author of books on the city's history).

"Where did the 'Salvation' group get such distorted information about the Society's income and expenditures?"

"Honestly speaking, I am at a loss to say. Representatives of the group were at our accountability conference and are familiar with the true figures and facts. I cannot believe that these people for whom we have the greatest respect are capable of spreading such malicious rumors. It is true that we have not yet been able to establish good contact with the group (with the exception of the quite business-like and fruitful cooperation we have had with Mikhail Talalay, an expert on cultural monuments, who is member of the council on ecology and culture which includes the 'Salvation' group). This is quite painful. I am convinced that even the most heated dialog between persons who love our city, cannot help but end up in nothing else except mutual understanding. True, it is more difficult to carry on a dialog with professionals and experts (among the Society's activists there are many such persons including prominent scholars, historians, art historians, architects, and artists) than it is with persons who are just being introduced to these areas of learning...



### Information for the Reader:

The Leningrad branch of the All-Union Society for the Preservation of Monuments and Culture [VOOPIK] in the period of one year collected from 483,000 members of the Society 176,000 rubles, 20 percent of which was transferred to the Central Council in Moscow. That money goes for the restoration of ancient castles, monasteries, and memorial estates in various localities of Russia.

With regard to the monuments of our city, in the most recent period Society funds were used for the restoration of the railing at the Summer Garden, the restoration of the former private residence of Kalkh-Aleksandrov, the House of Scholars, the Catherine Park in Pushkino, monuments in the necropolis of the Aleksandro-Nevskiy monastery, monuments to the Great Fatherland War, the former All-Mourners church, the church mosque, and for pre-restoration studies. The Society has no restoration, construction, or design organization whatsoever.

Now, as to the "selfish interest" of its associates.

The administrative apparatus of the branch is comprised of four persons. In addition, there are five consultants and each rayon of the city has one executive secretary. The average salary is 140 rubles. There are no bonuses.

The chairmen of the rayon branches and the chairman of the city branch, Academician B. B. Piotrovskiy, work on a voluntary basis with no remuneration.

These are the facts that are supported by documents. Thus, what source is actively spreading rumors throughout the city that the Society has an income of one-half million rubles and that it is using it for some unknown purposes? What is the source of these rumors that are equally offensive to the Society (and therefore to each of its 483,000 members) and to the "Salvation" group?

The answers to those questions did not require much effort. This sensationalist information was provided by Sergey Borisovich Lebedev at a session of the group that took place April 18, 1987. The minutes of the session (practically speaking, the minutes of Lebedev's presentation with the ostensibly previously rehearsed rejoinders that were so skillfully displayed) constitutes quite an impressive document.

Truths and half-truths, accusations that persons destroying priceless city monuments, adulation and slander mixed at random make all of this very difficult to analyze, particularly for a person who is poorly informed and perceives this information primarily from an emotional viewpoint.

In citing problems that are really urgent ones and that are of true concern to Leningradians (such as the pollution of Lake Ladoga or the fate of the Fontan House, or the condition of historic cemeteries), Lebedev began to

brand the persons he accused. And this would have been justified had it not been for one detail: The exposé of these deeds did not take it upon himself to find and name the true guilty parties. He called for severe punishment to be meted against those persons whom he, Lebedev, didn't like, those persons whom he intended to wipe off the books. He was not selective in his expressions. Every person who did not in the slightest suit Sergey Borisovich personally was to be placed immediately on the black list of the enemies of Leningrad; enemies of perestroika. The essence of the actual problem, however, drowned in the torrent of insults and was distorted beyond recognition.

Crude abusive language out of the mouths of the defenders of culture... How does one reconcile the two elements? But boorishness and injustice almost always go hand in hand. Verbal lack of discrimination not only comes from a lack of culture, but from unscrupulousness means. And worthless methods can discredit any purpose.

Reading the minutes of Lebedev's statement along with me was a person who has lived through, experienced, and done much more than I have. And this is what I heard: How lucky it is that we are not in the '30s now! After all, these are kind of frenzied "exposers" who helped maim the lives of thousands of persons."

Perhaps it would have not been worthwhile to write in such great detail about the actions and statements of Lebedev were it not for a looming tendency today wherein there are now persons who have perceived glasnost as giving them their own personal right to express themselves without wishing to hear other opinions and without allowing for even the existence of any other viewpoints or values. They are attempting to supplant the absolutization of official opinion with the absolutization of their own opinions or the opinions of certain groups. They are attempting to substitute one diktat for another. And whereas before the opinion of specialists yielded to the opinion of bureaucrats, now that opinion is beginning to yield to the opinion of clamorous dilettantes.

The people who are admired by Lebedev (by word of mouth) are few in number. The first among them is Dmitriy Sergeyevich Likhachev. That name has a bewitching effect on the ears of listeners. That is entirely understandable and natural. And Lebedev, in proclaiming his closeness to Academician Likhachev and his fidelity to his ideas wins supporters for himself.

However, I shall take the liberty of quoting Academician Likhachev: "...it seems to me that today the realization that one is not above reproach nor infallible has led to another sensation — a sense of revenge, retribution, the need to expose and judge others, but not oneself. Some people have come to understand glasnost as the right to slap the face of anyone who doesn't appeal to you...But



denunciation is a crucial and serious matter. One evil in response to another makes two evils... One must be careful and very circumspect about exercising the right to judge others."

Do you remember that quote: "Genius and Villainy — Two Incompatibles." Are in fact the ideas and style of Lebedev's statements compatible with such a thoroughly thought out and precisely expressed viewpoint?

It is also difficult to believe Lebedev's sincerity when he so flatteringly extols the "Salvation" group.

True, he doesn't like everything the group does. As he himself has said, "the sun too has spots." It does not suit him that during this year that has been a difficult one for the members of the group, they have grown up and matured, and that their youthful obsession (which has shocked some people, frightened others, and brought untold joy to others who are inclined to scandals) is being supplanted by serious purposefulness. And he is trying to add fuel to the fire by reporting to the group members that certain dark forces (meaning party, soviet organs, and the Leningrad press) have ostensibly joined forces in attempting to discredit them in the eyes of the public..

In the meantime Lebedev quite recently submitted an article to the editors about the Dostoevsky zone. He was told that the editors already had a letter on that topic that was prepared by the "Salvation" group. You should have seen the disdainful grin of a person had just labeled the group members to be practically the sole experts and defenders of the city. "What do they know! They are after all just helpless dilettantes!" (Lebedev is a historian by training).

On the other hand, when he speaks to the group at their meetings, he talks about them in unctuous complimentary tones. Lebedev attributes to the "Salvation" group everything that is being done in Leningrad to preserve the monuments (I emphasize he gives the group credit, and not the group to itself). Do the group members really need these kinds of truth-distorting compliments?

#### Information for the Reader:

On September 7, 1986 I. O. Fonyakov telephoned the Society for the Preservation of Monuments that "they are planning to demolish the Delvig house!" An emergency session of the presidium was convened. Representatives of the Leningrad State Planning and Surveying Institute of the State Industrial Committee for Transportation Construction [Lengiprometrotrans] were invited. The explanation was that the demolition of the building was permitted by the State Institute for the Preservation of Monuments [GIOP] (the building was not considered to be a valuable architectural monument), but was not approved by the

Administration for Culture. The metropolitan area construction workers did not suspect the need for such approval, according to their statements, and no one was informed of this at the GIOP.

After a thorough study of the situation, on September 11 the Society presidium sent a protest letter to the gorispolkom demanding that the building's demolition be prevented.

On October 19 youth groups came to the defense of the Delvig House, but by that day work on the demolition had already been halted. True, only the concerned organizations knew about the Society's actions. Everyone knew about the young people's protest.

One would think that the story of the Delvig House might serve as an obvious powerful textbook example of what happens in the absence of glasnost and what consequences result from organizational imperfections in the system of monument preservation.

#### Information for the Reader:

In accordance with the Charter of the All-Union Society for the Preservation of Monuments and Culture [VOOPIK] as approved by decree No 92 of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the Society is accord "active assistance to state organs for the protection of monuments in their work on the preservation and restoration of monuments and memorial sites."

Take note, the decree says "accord assistance."

Among such state organs in our city are the Main Architectural Planning Administration and its subdivision, GIOP (State Inspectorate for Monument Preservation) whose staff consists contains 80 specialists. Neither the restoration nor the destruction of a single architectural monument can be undertaken without the permission of the Inspectorate. I emphasize architectural monument. But the responsibility for recording and preserving historic monuments has been placed on an executor group for the monument preservation of another department of the gorispolkom and the Main Cultural Administration. So, you have a situation (as in the case of the Delvig House) where one hand doesn't know what the other one is doing.

One would think that the time has finally come to place all of the city's monuments under the jurisdiction of a single, genuinely responsible organization empowered with broad authority that, inter alia, would be obliged to inform all of us about any contemplated action concerning any monument.

In the meantime, the Society for the Preservation of Monuments are still getting calls from concerned Leningradians: "When will you finally begin work on repairing the Kazan Cathedral?" "Why are you not restoring the Monferran House?"

Probably, if everyone were informed about the rights, obligations, and opportunities of each organization engaged in monument affairs, such calls would be directed more accurately and there would be no fertile ground for slander.

Why is it that members (even if only part of them) of the "Salvation" group believe Lebedev? In no way can one reproach them for wishing to think about the matter or analyzing it. It seems to me that the problem is that people with honest thoughts and for whom the purpose and meaning of life is concern about their native city, find it difficult to imagine that one can speculate on a noble idea or that one would attach oneself to such an idea for mercenary purposes (in this case by mercenary I mean a greed for popularity and claims to "Messianism") and by the same token distort and discredit the idea.

Moreover, distrust in the bureaucracy gives rise to distrust in the "fighters" against bureaucracy. And then it no longer becomes hard to start thinking about just who this "fighter" is.

One must give credit to the members of the "Salvation" group where it is due. They refused to accept Lebedev into their ranks. However, they did not refuse to hear him out. To do so would have been a contradiction of glasnost and democracy. And he takes advantage of that stance. He heatedly talks about persecutions to which he has ostensibly been subjected, about the militia raids, and the threatening telephone calls. And they believe him. A martyr's hair shirt always evoke sympathy. And it is not so easy to distinguish that shirt from a skillfully and well planned tailored masquerade costume.

The purpose of the foregoing is not an attempt to open the eyes of the "Salvation" group members. I am sure that in time they will figure it out themselves. The purpose of what has been said is to explain to people that while listening to Lebedev they should understand where in his revelations there is a spoonful of honey and where there is a barrel of tar (no, I did not misspeak, I mean just those proportions), and naturally, in protesting such a mixture of truth and lies, this protest should be carried over to the "Salvation" group and to all "informal" in general.

Having used this term at random, simply because of a habit that has recently taken root, I would like to ask: Just why is it that we categorize the Society for the Preservation of Monuments which joins almost a half million Leningradians who love their city, among the formal associations? Is it because the only formality is that we pay membership dues? Perhaps it is because we ourselves have an indifferent and formalistic view of membership in this organization?

Incidentally, one should not forget that approximately three years ago a committee of volunteer restorer assistants, the group called "Mir," evolved within the Society

for the Preservation of Monuments, and that group does not merely exist but is actively engaged in the preservation of monuments. The group has worked on the restoration of the Peter and Paul Fortress, the Hermitage Theater, the Sampson Cathedral, the Pushkin apartment-museum, helped in the maintenance of the Chinese Village pavilions in Pushkino, worked on improvements in the Pavlovsk Park, worked on the Tait's aqueduct, at the Catherine Church in Murin, and the Savior on the Blood Church. The group worked without making loud noises about itself. Unfortunately, there was also silence about the group. And now it is relegated to the informal associations. In fact it is not a formalistic organization. In essence. But I would say, with no offense to many others, that all of that group's participants — members of the Society for the Preservation of Monuments — are the best members of the Society.

Everyone who is not indifferent to the fate of Leningrad was happy to learn about the decision of the gorispolkom concerning the buildings associated with the life of F. M. Dostoevsky. After all, it was the "Salvation" group which drew the attention of Leningradians and the city leaders to the fate of these buildings.

The fact that the voice of young people was heard means much more than this one specific victory. It is a reassuring indication of a changed attitude toward national historic sacred places in general.

The group began its fight to preserve the Dostoevsky homes about one year ago. That is well known. But in the interest of fairness, one should mention the following: As early as June 8, 1979 B. B. Piotrovskiy presented a letter to the gorispolkom which refuted the conclusions of the expert committee of the Leningrad Housing Planning Administration which confirmed the "inadvisability of undertaking capital repairs of the house at Gorkiy Street No 23/8 because of its complete deterioration." Petitions were submitted along the proper channels along with requests and demands. There was a lot... And the Society had accumulated piles of age-old correspondence on most of the problems that are being discussed openly today: suggestions, demands, and inquiries through channels. Unfortunately, at that recognized period of our life all of that frequently did not yield success. On the other hand, let us be frank, those undertakings required much more courage than is necessary today.

It is essential that we know and remember these things in order to appreciate fully how the attitude toward monuments and national history is changing before our very eyes these days. That is necessary in order to realize realistically (without backing down before difficulties, but also without exaggerating our own contributions) our own place in the matter of preserving our cultural heritage, and in order to overcome, finally, a lack of coordination.

A step towards meeting half-way is always fruitful (even if it is only one step). Quite recently, representatives of the "ERA" (Ecology of Common Architecture) group came to a session of the Society's presidium. The talks were respectful and unbiased. And it became evident that the fervor of youth and learning, the experience of prominent scholars and professionals are not in opposition to each other, but rather enrich each other.

I do not call upon informal groups to join (formally) the Society for the Preservation of Monuments. I do call upon them to consolidate their efforts. After all, it is not only confrontation (and I believe that the time of confrontation, if not already gone, is going) but also simply a lack of coordination that deadens the sense of both personal and common responsibility without which we cannot achieve anything, in any way whatever, including the preservation of the historic appearance of our city.

6289

#### **Uzbek Writer Questions Conventional View on Past 'Tyrants'**

18300017a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian  
25 Sep 86 p 4

[Article by literary critic O. Oskotskiy: "The Lessons of Historical Method: On the Trilogy "Stars Over Samarkand"]

[Text] Speaking about the work of the historical novelist, Sergey Borodin made the fine point that the mastery of the author of the novel "The Death of Vazir-Mukhtar" ["Smert Vazir-Mukhtara"], Yuriy Tynyanov, "is distinguished by his surprising ability to compress time". No matter how expansive the epoch scale of the novels which comprise the trilogy "Stars Over Samarkand" ["Zvezdy nad Samarkandom"], they nonetheless reduce time into the volcanic eruptions to which the individual episodes used as a basis for the subject matter of any particular chapter can be likened.

Akin to these eruptions of events of compressed historical time are bursts of imagery, born of the poetic energy of the word. One of such key images in the poetry of Sergey Borodin is that of the crimson reflections of the fire, in the hot flame of which dimly appear "the blazing cities, the horsemen leaping between burned out areas, the battles." It would seem to be all-consuming, this flame which flares on the pages of the novels "Timur the Lame" ["Khromoy Timur" — Tamerlane], "Campaign Fires" ["Kostry pokhoda"], and "Bajazet the Lightning-Charged" ["Molnienosny Bayazet"]. But it is only the unfeeling tree-branch which burns to ashes in it. "The people are not a faggot of twigs. The people survive. Even in the fires, they survive!" So speaks one of the heroes of the second book of the trilogy, inspired by the undying wisdom of the Armenian books which he, at the cost of his own life, saves from the conquerors.

"And, while falling from his saddle, he succeeds in flinging the book into the freezing-cold, the icy, the swirling, swirling, swirling current."

"A miracle occurred.

"Hundreds of years later, a farmer, scooping water from a stream, found an unusual stone. It was the book! The stone turned out to be heavy...

"He spotted an inscription on the outer surface of the rock. Having been saturated with pure siliceous water, the book had turned to stone. Now it is preserved in Matenadaran, where all the Armenian books, saved by ancestors in dark, past centuries, are kept. And the words which are written it have not been washed away, either by the water, or by time..."

What can the "Lord of the Universe" counterpoise to this ineradicable force of life, to this spiritual greatness of the people, compared to the destiny of which his own destiny is so small and insignificant, no matter what kind of deathly horror he might bring about. Is it not an intuitive realization of this harsh truth that gives rise within Timur to a sense of wonderment concerning the unprecedented resilience and persistence of a country — one of many countries conquered by him! — which he twice laid waste, twice destroyed, but which, in so doing, he did not force "into submission, into resignation"? Gnawed by a vain striving to create for himself an eternal place in history, he brings together in Samarkand innumerable treasures from all the lands he has plundered and, by the tens of thousands, drives skilled people, talented masters, together in his capital. "Those who destroy must create," the writer ironically lets fall in connection with this obsession with eternity, which his hero, as well, does not escape. "...Years afterwards, it became clear how fruitless this resettlement was. Torn away from their homelands to distant parts, neither masters nor scholars glorified the foreign Samarkand. The weapons which they had used to glorify their native Damascus did not shine here; there are no books written by scholars which were brought together in Samarkand, although their glory was great in the enlightened cities of India, Iran, Armenia, and Arabia, in their homelands." Destruction and creation are incompatible; careful attempts to join the one and the other are doomed to failure — such is the sense of the many dramatic scenes in the novel "Bajazet the Lightning-Charged", from which these words are taken...

"He (Timur — V.O.) is also considered to have been a shrewd politician, who unerringly senses the internal independence of his new subjects and understands how dangerous this was. But Timur's shrewdness had its limits. Like all tyrants, he thought it was possible to get rid of dissatisfaction by getting rid of the dissatisfied", Sergey Borodin reflected. In the novel "Bajazet the Lightning-Charged", this thought, embodied in an artistic image, takes on a broad, epic sound.

The novel "*Bajazet the Lightning-Charged*" was prepared for publication in the years when the official point of view prevailed that Timur played a progressive role not only in the history of Central Asia, but also within Moscow Rus: he facilitated and hastened its liberation from the Tatar Yoke. And he saved a number of European countries from Turkish conquest, since his victory over the sultan Bajazet hastened the fall of Byzantium.

Sergey Borodin's sharply critical attitude toward such an interpretation was evident not only in personal conversations, which I was fortunate enough to be a party to, but also in the pages of his final novel. This novel was the writer's principle argument against a position which he refuted with the entire artistic logic of his narration.

Publication of the novel in "*Druzhba Narodov*" was held up. Recalling my frequent but, alas, final meetings with the writer at precisely this time, I can testify that, convinced of his own correctness, he reacted calmly, with restraint, to these publishing difficulties. And he would even console me, then the chief of the prose department at the magazine; don't despair, he would say, such things always pass. This will pass too, and truth is on our side. In literature, what is right has always demanded firmness and courage...

Is it necessary to stir up the past after many years have gone by? In my view, this is necessary. Indeed, all the commotion which surrounded the novel *Bajazet the Lightning-Charged*, and the trilogy as a whole, at that time has become the writer's destiny, both in terms of his life and of his creativity. The triumph of life's instructive lessons, of the impressive triumph of Sergey Borodin's creativity, served in the final account to refute the arguments about Timur that existed at that time and which it is useful to recall today in order to more clearly understand how they have increased the significance and strengthened the resonance of the trilogy "*Stars Over Samarkand*". Invading these arguments, artistic thought turned out to be more farsighted and also more sharp-sighted than the transient conceptions promoted under the name of science. Because this thought was founded not on willful biases, but on consistent, recognized historical method. The ideas and images of the trilogy are organically related to the basic conclusion of Marx, who wrote about Timur that his "policy ... consisted of torturing, butchering, exterminating women, children, men and young people by the thousands and in such a manner as to produce terror everywhere".

Attempts to improve upon the history of our country and of the world, to ennoble its figures who, like Timur, distinguished by his "devilish and senseless cruelty", were "one of the greatest calamities" for entire peoples (in the words of Jawaharlal Nehru) are likewise unworthy of both science and art. Sergey Borodin reflected upon this when setting forth his design for the trilogy "*Stars over Samarkand*". "I decided to portray a particular type of conqueror, a kind of 'supra-human', pathological type, which is repeated through the centuries; I

decided to study the reasons which place such an individual at the head of a state, as well as this state itself — a monstrous, totalitarian creature which swallows up everything around itself". This, the justification by the writer of the social-analytical basis for realism in revealing the dialectical historical process, simultaneously takes the form of a defense of the objective truths of historical science. In this, one can also find a lesson concerning the historical method of artistic thought, which Sergey Borodin set forth in response to what he clearly perceived to be the demands of modern times.

There are very many today who debunk ideas of world supremacy. However, the current sharp resonance of the historical novel is not solely a product of their specific appearance. The constant struggle of peace-loving forces for the survival of mankind has nourished the theme, developed in the trilogy "*Stars over Samarkand*", that conquerors are foredoomed.

Rereading Sergey Borodin, we can rightfully acknowledge that, by his uncommon talent, with his inspiring mastery as an historical novelist, he has, in his own way, anticipated that which we today call new thinking. What does it mean to think in a new way for a writer whose creative search is carried out on the unbounded continent of an historical theme? The direction of his search, which is called upon to extend the horizons of our contemporary view of a centuries-old past. A broadly encompassing view, perceiving the destiny of peoples and states on the scale of world history. Deriving and affirming its highest humanistic values, which in our time have acquired a significance common to all mankind.

Happily combining within himself both writer and the scholar, Ales Adamovich names the absolute intrinsic worth of human life as the first and most important of these values: in the modern world, this, as never before, needs to be preserved and protected. And he reflects, within the context of the general and common tasks of literature and history, that "historical wrongs are most often mutual. You, and your ancestors, have not only been wronged, but have also caused injustices, wars, and so on, and so on. This is how history has developed — a history of class societies. Thus, has the time not come for the literatures of all countries to make a more active contribution to ensuring that the "black" record of mutual wrongs and pretensions is superseded by a "bright", noble "record"? But for this, a sober view of universal history is needed.

"If 'your own' Ghengis Khan or Tamerlane, or someone a little younger, a little fresher (historically) has killed or repressed neighboring and distant peoples, remember in this connection, and not only in this connection, how these near and distant peoples have come to your own lands, led by their own "great" blood-letters. Remember this and do not believe that "your" Ghengis Khans are

any better than the foreign ones. Only because they are "yours". These are the kinds of books that every literature, should give, at least one of, as a gift to itself. And to its own readers".

"*Stars Over Samarkand*", by Sergey Borodin, is precisely such a book...

13032

### **Uzbek Writers' Union Elects New Chairman from 3 Candidates**

18300017b Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian 7 Oct 87p 7

[Article by Literaturnaya Gazeta correspondents V. Sokolov and V. Tyurikov: "Board of Uzbek Writers' Union Holds Plenum"]

[Text] A plenary meeting of the board of the Uzbek Union of Writers has taken place, at which an organizational question was examined. With the aim of more actively involving young literary workers in the work of the writers' organization (the necessity for which has been discussed, in particular, in an article entitled "*Let's Talk Heart to Heart*" in *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, No 35, 1987), an additional 17 prose writers, dramatists, poets and critics were elected to the board. The auditing commission was also strengthened.

The plenum relieved U. Umarbekov of his duties as chairman of the presidium of the board of the Uzbek Writers' Union in connection with his appointment as Uzbek SSR Minister of Culture.

The work of the plenum was marked by a democratic discussion of candidates nominated for the post of director of the writers' organization. The members of the board proposed three candidates for thorough discussion — Uzbek SSR peoples artists A. Yakubov, E. Vakhidov, and S. Azimov. Taking part in the discussion were Said Akhmad, T. Pulatov, P. Kadyrov, N. Khudaybergenov, Isfandiyar, O. Sharafutdinov, S. Kulish, N. Vladimirov, O. Sidelnikov, Mirmukhsin, M. Kenzhabayev, and A. Matchan. E. Vakhidov also took the floor in the course of the discussions and withdrew his own candidacy.

A proposal was made at the plenum to hold a secret vote. But it was decided by a majority vote to elect the new director by open ballot. On the basis of its results, Adyl Yakubov was elected chairman of the presidium of the board of the Uzbek Writers' Union.

S. Azimov, B. Nararov, and O. Sharafutdinov were unanimously elected members of the presidium board.

Uzbek CP Central Committee secretary M. Kh. Khal-mukhamedov spoke at the plenum.

In their addresses, the literary workers repeatedly stressed the role of the writer in the work which is being carried out in the republic with regard to restructuring all spheres of social and economic development and the necessity for increasing the contribution of the creative intelligentsia to solution of the specific problems which today confront the working people of Uzbekistan. The speakers noted that there had been a frank discussion of this point at a meeting which the first secretary of the Uzbek CP Central Committee, I. B. Usmankhodzhayev, held with a Uzbek literary workers the day before. To join together on a highly principled basis, to unite the ranks of literary and artistic workers for the solution of important patriotic tasks, to direct their creative efforts toward socially significant themes, to demonstrate concern for the preparation of the young creative successor generation, and to improve the level of discussions — this is what is important today in the work of the Writers' Union.

13032

### **Afghan-Soviet Literary Relations Strengthened**

18310416a [Editorial Report] Baku *KOMMUNIST* in Azeri on 25 September 1987 carries on page 4 a 300-word Azerinform interview with Gulam Sahi Gayrat, secretary of the DRA Writers Union Ispolkom, headlined "We Are Using the Soviet Experience." In a talk with Anar, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Writers Union Ispolkom, he said: "In Afghanistan we must exploit the rich experience of cultural construction in the USSR and its participation in the cultural construction of artistic literature in a broad and competent manner. Successes in this sector in the Central Asian republics and Azerbaijan are especially interesting for us." The report adds that Gayrat, for whom Russian "has become a second mother tongue," has translated many Soviet literary works, for which service he has been awarded the Soviet-Afghanistan Friendship Prize "which was established by the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries."

### **Restoration of Historical Building Criticized**

18310416b [Editorial Report] Baku *KOMMUNIST* in Azeri on 2 September 1987 carries on page 4 a 1200-word article by the art historian Ziyadkhan Aliyev headlined "The Bitterness of Mistakes and Carelessness" on problems in the restoration of archeological monuments of historical importance, citing the khansaray of the Shaki Khans (1761-1762) as an example. He maintains that "despite the preservation of archeological monuments in Shaki and Baku and the occasional activity of administrations responsible for restoration, valuable buildings are in horrible condition. What disturbs us the most is the cold relationship of local organizations to architectural monuments. As a result of long-term neglect, buildings are falling to pieces."

/12232

### Azerbaijanfilm Chief Stresses Modern Themes

/12232

18310416c [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 4 September 1987 carries on page 3 an 1100-word interview with Ramiz Fataliyev, new director of Azerbaijanfilm, headlined "Art Should Not Lose Its Criteria" on problems and concerns of the Azeri film industry, noting that the two basic questions are "what should we film and why?" he claims that "the solution to the first question is related to scenarios and their artistic level, political actuality, public urgency and engagement with problems which disturb our contemporaries." In this context, he maintains that "the scenario is the soul of the film. We cannot move forward with scenario is the soul of the film. We cannot move forward with scenarios written about traditional themes whose time has past. Primarily, we need film writers able to capture actual problems of the time with great artistry and to pose questions which make viewers think." With regard to historical films, he says that "while there have been periods of great importance in our people's history, these have not been studied enough in our historical science."

/12232

### 'Creative Ethic' in Theater Stressed

18310461d [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 11 September 1987 carries on page 5 a 2700-word article by Teymurchin Afandiyev and Mahmud Allahverdiyev headlined "The Creative Ethic and the Theater." Quoting Gorbachev's statement that "openness means also criticizing shortcomings," the authors note that "the art ethic defines the artist's style in the collective creative process, directs it, and expresses his personality and creative ideal." They add that "an irresponsible relationship to the ethic does not conform to restructuring or to increasing modern demands." They also complain that "unfortunately, the contemporary Azeri theater does not give great importance to the actor's ethic."

/12232

### Critic Complains About Stereotypes in Prose

18310416e [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 11 September 1987 carries on page 6 a 3000-word article by Vagif Yusifli headlined "Paths of Development" on trends in Soviet Azeri prose literature. "We should note that in the prose of the 1970's a series of similar images which repeated each other were created. Heroes (a hero is conditional) travel from the village to the city, bustle about amid its wonders, and then long for the village and emerge as neither belonging to the city of the village. Thus, these characters, who resemble each other, are, in fact, only copies. It is impossible to achieve anything by imitating characters from the works" of other writers.

### Iranian Azeri Poem on 'Fatherland' Published

18310416f [Editorial Report] Baku ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT in Azeri on 18 September 1987 carries on page 8 a poem by the Iranian Azeri poet Firuz Dilanchi bearing the title "From the Cloudy Fatherland to the Sunny Fatherland." The poem was submitted to ADABIYYAT VA INJASANAT from Tehran and accompanied by a letter which claimed that the poem is dedicated to "the beloved poetess Madina Gulgun," who was born in Iran and now lives in the AzSSR. The text of the poem attempts to express the atmosphere of oppression in Iranian Azerbaijan.

/12232

### Short Life of Iranian Azeri Poet Featured

18310416g [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri on 23 September 1987 carries on page 4 a 1700-word article by Kamran Aliyev, can. phil. sci., on the life of Iranian Azeri poet Said Mashadi Khaliloghlu Salmasi (1887-1909). The article is headlined "Desires of a Romantic Poet," Pointing out that Salmasi was both a patriotic and a romantic poet, he adds that "these two mutually separate directions in Salmasi's work do not provide a basis for a discussion of the poet's contradictory world view. On the contrary, this balance stemmed from the life of society itself—from the victory and defeat of the revolutionary movement in Iran, from the hope of turning them into a subject of a poem separately." The author adds that biographical data on the poet were published in VARLYG (Tehran) 3/1986 and 5/1986.

/12232

### Tvardovskiy's Need to Write Poem on Stalin Discussed

18000002 Moscow OKTYABR in Russian No 8, Aug 87 (signed to press 4 Aug 87) pp 191-202.

[Article by Yu. Burtin: "'To You of Another Generation'—On the Publication of A. Tvardovskiy's Poem 'By Right of Memory'"]

[Text] So these words which stuck in my mind many years ago, in another life, it seems, have finally burst forth from the page of a journal:

...Cast off your father and your mother...  
The task is clear, the cause is sacred—  
And so—straight to the supreme goal.  
Betray your brother along the way  
And your best friend secretly.

And don't burden your soul with human feelings,  
Taking it easy on yourself.  
And give false witness in the name of,  
And commit savageries with the name of the  
leader.

Thankful for any fate,  
Just affirm one thing, that he is great,  
Even if you are a Crimean Tartar,  
An Ingush or a Kalmyk, friend of the steppes.  
Applaud all sentences,  
Which are not given us to understand,  
Slander the people with whom  
You have been thrown together in exile.

And in the stifling throng of outcomes—  
No, not biblical but of our day—  
Extol the father of peoples:  
He is above everything.  
He can see things better.

Not for a long time has our dear, "clever" poetry, stumbling over itself trying to think how to make a change to become more interesting—not for a long time has it heard such terrible pathos and such powerful sarcasm. It has become accustomed to play, to convention, and then suddenly Tvardovskiy comes with his stern, peasant-like, Tolstoyan straightforwardness. It will not, of course, be to the taste of literary epicures but it was not written for them. But the word of the poet has undoubtedly found and will continue to find a sympathetic and noble response in living human souls and in those people whom the "mute pain" of the people's fate has in actual fact tormented and does torment.

And still the first feeling of joy that the long poem had finally been published, and what is more—in the two leading journals (*Znamya*, No 2, 1987; and *Novyy Mir*, No 3, 1987), was followed immediately by a different feeling—regret and sadness: did it have to be published today!

Let us, perhaps, begin with that.

"Manuscripts do not burn." These words from the 24th chapter of Bulgakov's *Master i Margarita* [Master and Margarita] entered our consciousness as a password for the artist's determination and faith and bitter and courageous resolve to create, to carry out his destiny, even when hostile circumstances deprive him of any hope of seeing his work published. They are fine, proud words! Brilliantly affirmed by the fate of the novel where they were pronounced, they carried within them a powerful moral charge and in the hard years of the past they of course gave strength to many people.

But the truth of these words immediately becomes blasphemous untruth when a conciliatory, acquiescent tone is given to that same maxim (which the artist

himself will never give): well, they say, there is nothing terrible in that—if it was not published yesterday it will be published today or tomorrow, manuscripts, as they say, do not burn.

But I certainly want to object here. They do burn, no question! And how many of them have been consumed in our history—not only in far-off times but even in days more or less close to ours. Where, for example, are the manuscripts of Babel, Mandelshtam, Pavel Vasilyev, Voronskiy, Viktor Kino, Kharms, and tens and hundreds of other writers who fell victim to unjust repression? And how many talented works were trapped in the filters of the press itself and in the departments which control it! And how many—because of the certain impossibility of passing through these filters—did not even reach them... These are all losses for our thought and our culture and in many cases they are irreversible and irreplaceable.

That is the first point. But secondly, in a happier version, when a work which has lain in the drawer for reasons which do not depend on the author does finally reach the reader, but much later than its natural time—is this displacement from its own time not really at bottom the same as a loss?

Perhaps they will say: after all, the true values of art live for a long time and beyond the boundaries of their time.

You and I have eternity in store.  
What is it to us to lose an hour or two?!

In fact, are some 10-20 or even 50 years lost really so important if the work has centuries ahead of it? But on the other hand, they say that evil cannot exist without good. The work has lain unpublished for 10-20 years, so let us look now: has it withstood the test of time? It did, it is read with the former interest—well, then, let it live. If it seems outdated—it is possible that they did right not to let it out in its own time?

As for the last opinion, the cunning of it is revealed by a simple question: is it fair that such a preliminary "test of time" was usually prepared only for sharply critical books (films, plays) while safely dull books fly into print like birds? But the persuasiveness of the thesis about the indifference of genuine works of art to the time of their publication also seems illusory upon close examination.

Of course, the philosophical parable on life and death or the poem on love can in this sense be more independent, although even time leaves its imprint on the solution of "eternal themes." But is the meaning of literature really exhausted by the "eternal themes"? In most other cases taking a book, even a brilliant one, out of its time means depriving it to a great degree of vital social significance. Try to imagine, for example, *Dead Souls* published in 1862, in already reformed Russia, rather than 1842. Everything would remain there—the artistic merit of the portraits and landscapes, the lyrical digressions, Gogol's wonderful language, and the grandiose general idea—but



the shock and the upheaval in people's minds which this book caused in the generation of the 1840's would not have occurred at all. For the person of our day it would be fine classic reading which provided satisfaction and benefit but nothing more. The same thing would happen if Turgenev's *"Fathers and Sons"* had appeared in 1882, let us say, rather than 1862. Would this book have really roused all of reading Russia then, would it have become the subject of such fierce disputes, would it have had even a quarter of the impact on the spiritual self-determination of the new Russian intelligentsia as in the time which engendered it and for which it was intended?

There is a time for everything. Let us agree as if it were an axiom: when a talented significant work which meets the pressing needs of its time is very late in reaching the reader, that harms not only the work itself and its success and influence, but also the society whose development the work could have served, but did not. It did not serve in that single moment when it was particularly needed, and if it lives there for a thousand years afterwards, that moment will not be repeated and the loss will simply remain irreplaceable. And the loss is not only to that generation to whom the work was directly addressed, but through it—to the entire subsequent history of the people.

In our day, at the height of the universal fascination with the opportunity to read many things which were banned for many long years (here you have *"Novoye naznacheniye"* [New Appointment] by Bek, *"Requiem"* by Akhmatova, *"Kotlovan"* [The Pit] by Platonov, *"Sobachye serdtse"* [The Heart of a Dog] by Bulgakov, and the soon promised *"Doctor Zhivago"* by Pasternak), it is useful to keep all this in mind. In particular, in order not to give in to either the above-mentioned satisfied acquiescence (saying that everything ultimately works itself out and justice triumphs) or to the equally unfounded "disillusionment," saying, so they printed it, but nothing happened, it was interesting, of course, but the work did not become an event. Well, if today *"The Divine Comedy"* or *"Don Quixote"* or *"Faust"* or *"Quiet Flows the Don"* were published for the first time, would it be a turning point event of contemporary life able to affect each and every one? That is more than doubtful. The line at the library for the issue of the journal with such works of world classics would hardly be longer than the line for, for example, *"Pechal'nyy detektiv"* [The Sad Detective] by V. Astafyev, which is by no means classical in its artistic merits but ardently contemporary. That is just the point.

The fate of Tvardovskiy's last long poem, like the next to the last one *"Terkin in the Other World"* (1), which requires a separate discussion, serves as bitter confirmation of the above axiom. And not only in the sense that in both cases the prepared, finished work remained unpublished in our country for many years despite the author's desire. Something else is much more painful: the fact that in terms of its content and time of writing it belonged to one stage of social development but did not

reach the reader until another stage which was qualitatively different from the first, a time when another life is already stirring, with its own problems, and even earlier problems are already different somehow on account of the years that have passed.

*"You of A Different Generation,"* in order to interpret the long poem *"By Right of Memory"* in the proper manner, must share the publicist's pathos which animates it and above all understand its relationship to the time which gave birth to it. But what do the main mass of contemporary readers, those who are now 30-35, or even more so 20, know about that time, about our 1960's? I dare to assert almost nothing. And how should they know? Today's young person, if he even remembers this period of history, at best remembers it as his childhood years, which his adult life has not yet managed to deal with. They are not discussed in school and if an incomprehensible statement about overcoming some kind of "subjectivism and libertarianism" is uttered, it goes in one ear and out the other. This time is not shown on television either, or written about in novels or historical works. As a result our young contemporary has a clearer understanding of the war or of the NEP than about the still recent past. It is true that in some places their mothers and fathers may have told them, but with rare exceptions they themselves do not know how to treat this phase of our life, to curse it or praise it.

So it happens that before any other criticism the long poem *"By Right of Memory"* today requires simply real historical commentary—without evasions or passing over in silence.

The main question is why did Tvardovskiy feel the need to write a long poem about Stalin in the second half of the 1960's? Even in 1963 when earlier drafts of some of its lines were done, and especially in 1966 when the theme which had come to him earlier returned to him and compelled him to take it up in earnest, (2) Stalin was already the past, though not too far off yet, well remembered, unique, but still the past and removed from the present not just by 10-15 years but by a whole period of social development. Did he suddenly feel like writing a historical poem? That would certainly be unlike Tvardovskiy. In his poetry he always lived by what the people, the people as a whole rather than a certain group of people, live by in the particular stage of their social existence and it was precisely on this all-people's level which he perceived all the historical turns and changes; he was a kind of chronicler of the age but by no means a writer—"storyteller" in the ordinary sense of the word. In your mind recall all his major works—not one of them was "simply that way," at the whim of free poetic fantasy, but all seemed to follow the will of history and each one revealed some new major area of the people's life, expressing it in its most essential features. In *"The Country of Muravia"* this area was the 1930's and their spiritual upsurge and the optimism, untouched by any doubt, of building a new life. In *"Vasilii Terkin"* it was war as a particular historical age in its national and



universal meaning and significance. In "The House by the Road" it was the first postwar years "with all the misfortune—yesterday's war And today's hard fortune." "Terkin in the Other World" deals with the social crisis of the late 1940's-early 1950's when the contradictions of the bureaucratic regime which had matured reached the critical point. In "The Distance Beyond the Distance" it is the period from the mid-1950's, the time of the resolution of the above-mentioned crisis and the resulting social upsurge. In all these cases it seems as if the poet did not choose his own theme, as people do not choose the time in which they live, but rather the theme itself chose him, and precisely him, as its herald and chronicler. His creative fantasy was daring and rich (recall the subjects of "Muravka" or "Terkin in the Other World"), but it never dominated Tvardovskiy's creativity; it merely helped him find the most complete expression of the truth of the people's life. Indeed, is "By Right of Memory" like a historical poem? It has lyrical parts and angry and passionate sociopolitical invective.

Another interpretation of that guiding motif which inspired the author to create a new long poem has been proposed: the feeling expressed in the early rough drafts of 1963 that he had left something fundamental about Stalin and his time out of his earlier works. "This evidence (that initially Tvardovskiy wanted to add a new chapter to the poem 'The Distance Beyond the Distance'—author)," writes V. Dementyev, "and this line which begins with the words 'I left something unsaid' is also extremely important to us:

I left something unsaid.  
Can I leave Such a speech incomplete.  
Remove here, add there—  
Thus is a portion of the truth neglected.

Here the main moral-philosophical idea of the poem is clearly formulated: the truth about the people's life must not be partial or "selective," nor must it contain neglected or deliberately hidden elements...." (3)

There is a definite reason for this: the demand for complete truth, the feeling that "something has been left unsaid," and the dissatisfaction with oneself related to this are entirely typical motifs for Tvardovskiy. Let us note, however, that the lines which the critic emphasized so strongly in fact remained in the rough draft and did not go into the final text. And for all their correctness, if they had would not the "main moral-philosophical idea of the poem" have been somewhat impoverished? Well, of course, the complete truth is better than the incomplete truth, but, taken in such general form, does this truth need poetic proof? After all, that would be no more than the correctness of a truism.

And to talk about the "leaving something unsaid" (if one assumes that in 1966-1969 this motif continued to trouble the poet)... For that is the question: why was it precisely the theme of Stalin that he tested for the need to "leave nothing unsaid"? There certainly were plenty

of other "incomplete" themes that remained! And, on the other hand, plenty had already been written about the repressions of the "period of the cult of personality" by then! In every genre—the publicistic, the scientific-historical, the artistic, and in the memoir form—memory easily suggests books and names. Then why in precisely this direction and at precisely that moment did Tvardovskiy feel like "leaving nothing unsaid"?

As we see, the proposed explanation itself in turn needs to be explained and thus instead leads us away from the essential point...

However, no answer need be sought to the question posed—it is given in the poem itself, whose whole final chapter is just such an answer. From the very first lines:

Forget, forget they order silently,  
They want to drown the living past  
In forgetfulness. And let the waves  
Close over it. Forget the past!

They command to forget and sweetly ask  
Not to remember—lock up the memory,  
So as not to accidentally upset  
The uninitiated by that declaration.

Here it is, the direct and immediate source of the poem. Not in "abstract" love for the fullness of truth, but in courageous resolve to resist—"by right of memory"—very concrete attempts to ban truth and the premeditated, deliberately organized "oblivion" of the crimes of the Stalinist times. But from whom did this ban come and for whom and why was it needed?

What special congress,  
By procedures unintroduced,  
Decided for us  
To give up forever  
This sleepless memory,  
Precisely this memory.

In 1969 this was clear to almost everyone who was not ignorant of social life and followed the direction of its development; but today it requires explanation.

In the three and one-half decades that have passed since Stalin's death, public interest in this person has invariably remained very high. To no small extent also preserved by the atmosphere of secrecy which even during the most critical exposes surrounded his name, this interest is mainly a result of the fact that despite the most varied, even diametrical opposed evaluations of the personality and historical role of Stalin by representatives of various social groups, this role was objectively very great and concentrated within it the historical circumstances on a truly gigantic scale which decisively influenced the fates of tens and hundreds of millions of people. Nonetheless, it may be asserted that the discussion of this theme acquired a specifically political character essential to the direction and results of our social

development only twice during the space of time mentioned. The first time was in 1956-1964, during extensive and active criticism of the "cult of personality" and the second—in the second half of the 1960's when suppression of this criticism became just as active and well-organized. This second period interests us here for the most part, but its historical sense can only be understood against the background of the first period.

People often talk of the time in common parlance called the "Khrushchev era" with a scornful smile. And there are reasons for that. But still let us say immediately: such arrogance seems both unhistorical and morally questionable. Just throwing open the gates of the camps and having the courage to acknowledge—to the whole world—the "mass repressions" of unprecedented cruelty and scope against our own people—these things alone are already enough to recall this time as one of the greatest pages of our history.

The following must also be kept in mind. The wave of criticism of Stalin raised by N.S. Khrushchev's report to the 20th CPSU Congress "On the Cult of Personality and Its Consequences" grew from year to year, encompassing more and more stages and aspects of his activity and gathering depth and strength. What were initially considered regrettable "mistakes" and "deviations from Leninist norms" were at the 21st Party Congress (1961) directly and bluntly called "evil deeds," "criminal acts," and "disgraceful methods of leadership." And the main thing, the criticism "from above" was taken up<sup>(4)</sup> and intensified many times over by the expanding critical movement "from below." And although there was a certain lack of synchronization among certain aspects of the process, even at time quite acute contradictions,<sup>(5)</sup> on the whole this was still a unified process whose objective historical sense consisted of democratization and the replacement of Stalin's "barracks communism" (which Marx and Engels warned against)<sup>(6)</sup> with a qualitatively different type of socialism based on fundamentally different foundations. In the economy—not on coercion to labor but on material interest in its results; in the system of management—on democratic (instead of authoritarian-bureaucratic) centralism with expanded independence "locally" and elements of control "from below"; and in foreign policy—on the idea of peaceful coexistence (instead of hostile opposition) of the two worlds and on seeking opportunities for mutual understanding and cooperation.

A great deal has been said, and justly, about the shortcomings of the criticism of Stalin at that time, the main ones being restricting historical responsibility to the personal guilt of one or a few persons, reducing history to mere statements, and cutting off any attempts to present any consistent analysis of the causes, conditions, and consequences of the published bloody facts. It is also true that the process of social transformations to which this criticism gave spiritual and political form, moral imperative, and a reference point occurred in a chaotic and uneven manner and in many respects "by trial and

error." Without any thorough theoretical thought of that uniquely integrated, complete, and logical system from which they wanted to retreat, and of what they intended to reach, and, finally, of the very ways, stages, and methods of restructuring. Without deliberate, consistent liberation of the initiative and social independence of the masses, which could only give the process of democratization real force and irreversibility. Moreover, with repeatedly renewed attempts to resolve new tasks with old dictatorial methods, transformations of the top levels of the apparatus, and universal introduction of ephemeral but obligatory economic panaceas.

Today we have no reason either to hide from ourselves these shortcomings which at that time seriously impaired the energy, depth, and efficiency of the purging process or to minimize them. On the contrary, they must be fully recognized, particularly so that such mistakes are not repeated in the new stage of renewal. And all the same, all the same... Be that as it may, the steps taken at that time were generally in the direction of the human being rather than away from him or above him; though the process went on in a contradictory and interrupted way and though it did not manage and was not successful in reaching even relative completion, it was internally significant and historically promising. It was focused in the same direction as our present restructuring.

The Stalinist theme surfaced in an altogether different way several years later.

It became clear, by no means immediately, that Khrushchev's removal in October 1964 was not simply a replacement of leadership but the start of a new period in the country's life. It was an event which in terms of its consequences was almost equivalent to the 20th Congress, but in the opposite sense. It was an action directed not only against "libertarianism" and unrestrained experimentalism (the only motive which it offered as an explanation and which at the time seemed convincing to many people) but also essentially against that positive social process which comprised the content of the previous historical period. Little by little, however, especially toward the end of the decade when the brakes were put on the idea of economic reform, this became fairly obvious (although as before there were no direct statements on this account).

The point is not that a restoration of the Stalinist regime took place: this would have been impossible and the elementary feeling of self-preservation could not fail to be a hindrance here. As has always happened in history, the restoration in this case too was only partial and relative. One can even put it this way: all the transformations in the system and everything new that the "Khrushchev era" introduced into the economic and sociopolitical organization of our society and into the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet State, the new era preserved and consolidated. With only one exception: that process of democratization which was talked of above was stopped and abandoned. And that was enough

to radically change the whole picture. Even though the previous period in this regard (as in a number of other others, for example in the growth and intensification of production) achieved only a little, still the society was in motion and searching; a strong tendency toward self-change was alive in it. The situation was contradictory but dynamic and open. And then all this was stopped, the dynamics became static, and this stasis of itself became numbing stagnation. The social structure which was established as a result of this operation of subtraction (socialism minus democracy) was, of course, in many respects more elastic than that which existed until the mid-1950's, but both one and the other considered administrative abuse, the authoritarian-bureaucratic character of interrelations between the manager and the masses, and the system of privileges for the higher levels of the conical social hierarchy to be the unwritten norm; and both the one and the other in proclaiming the movement's slogans and in reality were internally oriented only to marking time and supporting and preserving the status quo. It is well known what that led to.

But it was precisely the change in emphasis regarding Stalin and the line on his moral rehabilitation in the eyes of the people that became the ideological form of this "subtraction," a kind of emblem of the changed official principle.

This line was carried out consistently and, it must be confessed, not without success. It was by no means a direct negation of the revelations made earlier—that would have been difficult and could have had the opposite effect—but a well thought-out combination of half-truth and silence. Half-truth in the sense that it dealt with Stalin's role in the Patriotic War, the only feature of his biography which could be morally positive in the eyes of society. And silence about all the rest.

The fact that in previous years, by contrast, very little had been said about Stalin's activity during the war and what was said came grudgingly and with one-sided emphasis on his mistakes and on the obstacles which his despotism put in the way of organizing certain war operations. (Tvardovskiy, a proud man, never joined the chorus and was at that time one of the few who spoke out against such one-sidedness—see the chapter "That Is How It Was" from the long poem *"The Distance Beyond the Distance,"* especially in the 1960-1961 editions). And now, as if to correct the injustice committed, which, one must say, annoyed many people at the time, first individuals and then in an ever-expanding flock memoirs, films, and finally novels came out which accustomed the reader and the viewer anew to the idea of Stalin's particular merits—as military leader, strategist, and leader of the anti-Nazi coalition. On the other hand, they generally did not mention anything that was bad for the Leader's reputation. Not even those same frequent blunders of his military leadership. Not to mention his general responsibility for the heavy price victory cost us. Nor that in 1937-1938 he beheaded our army by destroying the flower of its command, nor of the treaties with

Germany in August and September 1939, one of whose results was giving Hitler the opportunity to concentrate his divisions directly on our borders, nor of the many, many other cruel and terrible things which are associated with this name in our history. A secret ban was put on all this.

In this way the desired effect was achieved: the reflected light of the war, which was sacred and right, in falling on the uniform of the generalissimo at the same time seemed also to illuminate his political biography as a whole. In that light everything that he did both before and after the war received at least the significance of state necessity, foresight, and rightness, if not unquestioned justification. And that in turn spread to the general description of that stage of social development which then could no longer be called the "period of the cult of personality"—people again began to speak of it almost in the same tone as before 1956 (see, for example, the works of S.P. Trapeznikov on collectivization).

This entire ideological shift took place by degrees and without a lot of noise, but even its "small signs" did not escape the attentive stare of the contemporary and told him much. And the fact that the wave of criticism of the "cult" began to subside faster and faster, gradually shrinking to one single ritual phrase pronounced on important holidays in the leadership report and every year more and more incomprehensible. And the fact that both in articles and books on the posthumously rehabilitated "champions of the great cause" the sad endings of their biographies began to be cut off in the same way, leaving the reader in ignorance of what became of the hero later and whether he prospers to this day. And then even their very names again began to disappear little by little from printed pages so as not to arouse bad memories.

In these circumstances the new and so decisive return to the theme of the crimes of Stalin's regime had a fully definite and clear political sense: it was an open and sharp protest. And it was possible at that time (if at all possible) in only one organ of our press.

Volumes are yet to be written, one must think, about Tvardovskiy's *Novyy Mir*, the truly historical significance of this journal in the spiritual development of our society, and about what it fought for and against, and on the other hand who fought against it and how, and finally about the result this struggle had not only for the journal and its editor but for the society as a whole. But even a commentary to the long poem *"By Right of Memory"* is impossible without saying at least a few very brief words about this subject.

Incidentally, in light of what was said above about the contrast between the two periods (the curtailed "Khrushchev" period and the "Brezhnev period" which had just

begun at that time) within which the history of Tvardovskiy's journal took place, the essence of the matter can actually be defined very concisely. In fact, what is *Novyy Mir* if it is viewed from the standpoint given by the foregoing analysis?

Before 1964 it was a journal which was formed quite rapidly into the leading organ of the democratic renewal of Soviet society and embodied the course of the 20th Party Congress with the most consistency, clarity, and completeness. Of course, it was not consistency in the sense of some special constancy and depth of theoretical realization of the processes of development of our society: our social thought does not have that, alas, even now. But at least in three other very important senses. First, in the critical representation and artistic interpretation of the path taken by the country. No other press organ went so far in this regard nor said so much bitter and cruel but necessary truth about the Stalinist epoch as Tvardovskiy's journal did. Secondly, in the dissemination of the same critically sober approach to reality in contemporary times (unlike that venal literature which is sometimes ready to denounce the dead tyrant but becomes a sweet-voiced siren at the threshold of the present day). Thirdly, in the uncompromising struggle against the forces of retardation at that time. These forces were very influential and were preparing for revenge—the struggle against them gradually came to make up the main content of the journal's critical section.

But after 1964 when the situation changed radically the criticism of the "cult of personality and its consequences" was curtailed and all the rest of our journals and newspapers—some more quickly and joyfully and some more slowly and with less enthusiasm—reflected and consolidated the change that had occurred and Tvardovskiy's *Novyy Mir* remained the only Soviet journal which remained completely faithful to the former course for more than another 5 years. For more than 5 years, overcoming more and more persistent opposition and with blows raining down from all sides, it struggled against bureaucratic restoration and for bolstering and developing the ideas of the 20th Congress and for the democratic consciousness of society. And for truth. And it fell in this unequal struggle, without retreating even one step.

At the time the foreign press racked its brains over how to define the public position of Tvardovskiy, the poet and editor: was it a "party" position or an "opposition" position? A party position? Then why was one of his poems not published for 9 years and another for 18, and the journal he headed initially subjected to long years of siege and massive bombardment and then captured by all the rules of the art of war (with deceptive maneuvers, a landing force, and so on)? An opposition position? Then why was it at that time that it was precisely his, Tvardovskiy's, poetry about Lenin that our children

memorized in school? And why does this name remain just as great for the author in the last poem as 10 years, or 20 years, or even 30 years before it?

It always seemed that next to him  
Was the one who had given us his earthly  
replacement,  
The one who did not like ovations  
Or at least knew what they were worth.  
The one whose image the world kept alive  
And eternal beyond the transitory bound...

Is this an opposition position?

It seems they simply did not reach any generally convincing decision. And, perhaps, it is understandable why not: because the question itself was formulated wrongly. It was purely a logical mistake, consisting of the initial belief that party-mindedness and opposition-mindedness are incompatible, opposites. At the same time, however, one should ask oneself for a start: what kind of party-mindedness? The kind that is expressed in the lines of verse that head this article, for example:

The task is clear, the cause is sacred,  
And so—straight to the supreme goal.  
Betray your brother along the way... and so on.

After all, this is not even poetic hyperbole but simply the most everyday reality—that party-mindedness which compelled a person to reentrust his thought and conscience to a certain higher supreme will which is primordial and eternally infallible and in the name of the undoubtedly clear and undiscussable goal demanded enthusiastic blindness and joyful obedience to this will. Or, in contrast, that party-mindedness which assumes completely different, democratic consciousness and behavior and a sovereign and responsible human personality, which on behalf of the common good lives and acts according to its own understanding,

Entrusting the country from end to end,  
Your own fate and the fate of your children  
Not to God, But only to your own  
Proprietary wisdom.

In the same way, opposition mindedness—to what? To the course which was drawn by the 20th Congress and which opened up the prospect of democratic development to our society? Or, in contrast, to the policy which contradicts this course and closes off this prospect? To explain "party-mindedness" and "opposition-mindedness" without posing such questions to oneself is certainly nonsense. As Mayakovskiy asked the financial inspector:

And what if I am the leader of the people  
and at the same time the people's servant?

here too one could ask: what if Tvardovskiy's position for some reason also went against the ideological line of L.I. Brezhnev and M.A. Suslov, and was truly party-minded—in the spirit of the 20th Congress, and in the anticult, antibureaucratic, democratic, people's sense?

In fact it by no means follows from the fact that foreign criticism did not pose the question of the opposition-mindedness of Tvardovskiy and his journal correctly and our own press avoided it altogether (7) that the question simply does not exist. It is absolutely real and deserves calm, serious study (and today demands it—in connection with the tasks of our present restructuring).

It is remarkable that the conversations about *Novyy Mir* as an "opposition" journal arose no earlier than 1965-1969, although its aesthetic and sociopolitical line and leadership position in literature were completely defined some 5 years earlier.

As a journal with a definite direction *Novyy Mir* was a child of the epoch of the 20th Congress. Before that time, from the start of the 1930's, there were no such publications in our country and, moreover, there could not have been. And those that somehow still managed to appear did not survive.(8) Even in this regard the 20th Party Congress was a genuine turning point in significance. Under its liberating influence, in a situation where the country faced the need to interpret its path and the results and prospects of this path anew, different and in many respects mutually repellent trends of social thinking could not fail to take shape. This democratic multiplicity of voices that was forming essentially meant that society, which up to that point seemed to have been absorbed by the state and turned over its functions to the state, was again acquiring its own spiritual sovereignty and returning to a full life. The appearance of publications with direction—and not only *Novyy Mir*, to which Tvardovskiy returned in July 1958, became one, but also, with varying degrees of clarity, *Yunost* under V.P. Katayev (1955-1962) and in part *Literaturnaya Gazeta* under S.S. Smirnov (1959-1960), while at the opposite ideological pole were V.A. Kochetov's *Oktyabr*, the newspaper *Literatura i Zhizn* (1958-1962), and certain other publications—was a clear manifestation of this positive social process.

The contrast of the ideological-aesthetic positions which found its expression both in the journals and newspapers named above and in many others was in some cases very great and could by no means be reduced to that natural diversity of individual viewpoints which is expressed by the saying: "There are just as many opinions as there are people." Nor was this contrast explained by the widespread and superficial idea of the notorious "cliquishness" of literary figures. No, these were to a significant extent principled and stable disagreements of very different sociopolitical trends, among whom a serious struggle was going on. And nevertheless, one can assert without in any way falling into idyllic starry-eyed idealism that not one of these trends was an opposition trend

at that time. There was no political opposition in the country since there were no grounds for it: the opportunity for open self-expression for practically every trend of thought able to count on some broad social support in point of fact excluded the probability of its appearance.

The situation which took shape in the second half of the 1960's when the line of the 20th-22nd party congresses had been cut down and the movement of social thought which it brought to life proved to be unwelcome was something else. As a river blocked by a dam will try to cut through it, so the democratic movement forcibly suppressed and stopped short in its natural development inevitably had to turn into opposition. And it did.

Of course, not all of it. The conservative wing of the same movement, which even before had tried to narrow the front and moderate the sharpness of criticism of Stalin and minimize changes in the system of leadership which he had created, could only rejoice in the changes which had taken place. For it was precisely their mental attitudes which now acquired the force of an official ideological platform (although out of tactical considerations this platform considered it useful to depict itself as "centrist" and at times even seemed to distance itself somewhat from the Stalinist excesses). Nor did the conformist "silent majority" turn into opposition; by virtue of its ideological spinelessness and low moral standards it is ready to go along with any policy, if that policy allows it to adapt itself in some way to that policy on the everyday level. But the most vital, socially active, and responsible part of the intelligentsia and of society as a whole, that part which did not simply support the course of the 20th Congress to democratic transformations in the social structure, but, paraphrasing Mayakovskiy, could say: "my democratization" lived by it, linked its hopes and socialist ideals with it, and wanted to see it as complete, consistent, and radical as possible and, as it could, encouraged that—in the changed conditions this part of society was essentially doomed to opposition-mindedness and simply had no other choice.

The conversion of part—and, let us emphasize, the best part—of the democratic movement of that time into an opposition movement and of the energy of positive social transformations into the energy of protest is a sad and dramatic page of our history. For a considerable number of people this became a loss of faith in socialism; the fates of most of those whom the impossibility of straightforwardly and frankly expressing their disagreement with the new official line pushed toward illegal forms of political self-expression proved to be tortuous. Some were compelled to bid farewell to the motherland and others to bear punishment "to the full extent of the law." We do not mean, by hindsight, to free them from responsibility for any of their particular actions, even those which were evoked by the conditions and logic of the struggle: that is an individual moral and legal problem in each particular case. But the responsibility of the other side should certainly be recognized as well. Those

who turned this law against democracy, in our conditions socialist democracy. Those who thus appeared as the source and on the legal and moral level—the ones to blame for the emergence of political opposition in our country.

People will perhaps say: the one who lit the fire put it out; the one who created the opposition (as the inevitable cost of replacing the political course) also very quickly (and bloodlessly too) eliminated it.

It is true, as it is true that considerable energy and resourcefulness was shown in carrying out this operation. But, first, let us recall once again that these virtues would not have been required if the people who so skillfully and methodically exterminated the "heretical thinking" themselves had not first created it. And secondly—and this is the main thing—the victory of which we are speaking proved to be so expensive for the country in the not-too-distant historical future that it could be considered equivalent to a very terrible defeat.

The goal was altogether achieved. The intelligentsia stopped flying into a rage and causing trouble: saying things that people did not want to hear, writing various collective letters, and protesting. The desired silence reigned. Not completely and not literally, of course: novels and films came out and the press more or less successfully created an impression of diversity and the struggle of critical opinions and discussion of topical problems. But this struggle went on within predetermined limits and with the predetermined solution; the discussion of problems—with the indisputable condition of not dealing with the real roots of the evil; a game, wordplay, a mixture of deception and self-deception. So there was a decade and a half of that life, leading to the truly terrible result to which we came. The economic result, of which enough has already been said today, and the almost more serious moral and spiritual result: we have yet to properly realize it. A society which seemed to have been deprived of the intelligentsia, if that is taken to mean not simply people of certain professions but what it has always been in Russia since the times of Fonvizin and Radishchev—the brain and conscience of the nation. A society in which the predominant psychological type was the indifferent person not really interested in anything who easily pronounces any words but does not experience anything too deeply, has forgotten how to be ashamed and despise, who works without satisfaction and at half strength; and the person in whom along with the catastrophic disintegration of civic feelings strictly personal feelings have dulled and dried up. A society which needs the restructuring which has started for its salvation but which up to now has not yet proven its capacity for this restructuring in earnest.

The guilt of the policy which provoked the conflict of the democratic movement with the authorities was in this way multiplied many times over by the method of resolving this conflict which the authorities chose to use.

All this was most directly related to *Novyy Mir* and to Tvardovskiy's long poem which interests us.

If one stays within the limits of that conceptual line, then as a journal which more and more clearly and deliberately opposed the official ideological line (as it was in turn manifested and revealed more and more), the *Novyy Mir* of the second half of the 1960's was objectively an opposition journal. And the fact that Tvardovskiy himself considered his journal strictly a party journal and it really remained so—a party journal in the spirit of the 20th Congress and in the sense of an independent but consistent expression of the democratic trend in socialism—does not at all prevent that conclusion. For in the changed conditions such a party spirit was already definitely unsuitable; loyalty to it called forth disobedience and protest.

The main organ of the democratic opposition of the 1960's, in this sense *Novyy Mir* was an absolutely unique phenomenon in Soviet journalism.<sup>(9)</sup> Its uniqueness in this sense was that it was, first, a legal journal and one which declared its program clearly and openly. (No matter how paradoxical this sounds, in some sense it was even more legal than publications which expressed the predominant system of views and were compelled even to avoid naming things by their own names, masking the change in policy which was occurring and pretending that no restoration of the ways abandoned by the people was going on). Secondly, this was the organ of socialist opposition, opposition based on the idea of socialism capable of democratization and open democratic self-development. This was a position which was internally stable. Of course, it could be criticized from the most varied standpoints and no such criticism should be brushed aside; however, its reserves of strength proved to be at least great enough so that today, 20 years later, in our hopes for restructuring we are in fact living by precisely that idea and no other.

An opposition journal in Soviet history? How is that to be treated? First of all as a fact which like any historical fact must be recognized and understood. Understood in its origin and in its particular social content. And then it must be evaluated in conformity with its real historical significance and its place in relationship to the general perspective of human progress. As applied to this case, our evaluation will prove to be directly dependent on how we understand the course of development of Soviet society during the last 30 years. Do we consider that sharp turn which the 20th Party Congress made a blessing for the country and for the destiny of the people and of socialism? Do we further acknowledge that the subsequent development of our society was not an equal ascent from step to step? Not only in the sense of the existence of some partial snags and contradictions but also in the sense of movement—in a particular stage—in accordance with the principle one step forward, two steps back, a turn backwards, and then protracted crumbling stagnation? If we do acknowledge that—and today it

is impossible not to—then taking into account everything which was said above there is only one answer to the question posed: the answer will undoubtedly be in favor of Tvardovskiy and the journal.

There are times when a public figure, if he is a real citizen and patriot, is forced to move against the current, against the majority. And so it is!—in his solitude he weighs more on the scales of history than the whole crowd of his opponents and adversaries. That is exactly how things were with Tvardovskiy the editor, a prominent public figure of our time. Lenin once made a fine statement about the publisher of *Kolokol*, who during the uprising in Poland stood firmly for the rebels, thereby even disagreeing with the majority of his former allies: "Herzen saved the honor of Russian democracy." (10) These words are also applicable to the person who, in completely different historical circumstances but in approximately the same way, saved the honor of our intelligentsia and Russian democracy of the Soviet 1960's.

Let us add in conclusion: if Tvardovskiy's *Novyy Mir* is a glorious page in the history of Soviet journalism, then the last 5 years of his existence were the best time for this journal, its hour of the cross, but also its height of glory. Never had its significance been so great, above all its moral-rectifying significance. The point is not that the journal published only prominent works, although a large part of what was best in the literature of that time reached the reader through its pages. The point was its integrity, loyalty to the truth, and loyalty to oneself. The journal seemed to say by its own example: this means it is possible not to betray one's human dignity, it can be preserved! In this sense any story or review printed in *Novyy Mir* and therefore read sympathetically and avidly frequently meant more than many much more fundamental publications of previous and subsequent times. And the more alone this journal remained in its struggle, the more densely the clouds thickened above it and the stronger its social impact and authority became.

Are there not contradictions here with what was said above? We praised the post-Stalin period as a time when there was democratic difference of opinion but no political opposition and condemned those people who by changing their course brought about its appearance. But still we praise *Novyy Mir* precisely for the courage to oppose, that is, for opposition-mindedness. That is exactly right, but it only illustrates the fact that truth is concrete.

Incidentally, although considering ourselves to have no right to decline to participate in the dispute over "party-mindedness or opposition-mindedness"—and after using the corresponding terminology to explain our thinking, we by no means consider it the best formulation. "Opposition-mindedness" is a word that is too general and therefore imprecise. It is better, in our opinion, to speak of the fact that the second half of the 1960's was a time of acute struggle between the two

trends in socialism: the bureaucratic-conservative and the democratic. And to the extent that the large-scale campaign to organize social memory loss was an instrument of bureaucratic restoration, memory became a weapon for opposing it. And the primary organ of this historical memory that did not submit to forced lulling or curtailment was Tvardovskiy's journal *Novyy Mir*, for which this last long poem was intended.

Expressively and solidly titled "*By Right of Memory*" the long poem was born as an act of opposition and as a continuation of that struggle which its author and the journal he led were waging against the ongoing restoration trend. The point was neither Stalin as such nor the desire to say something about him that "had been left unsaid" for the sake of completing the picture, but those people who for self-seeking interests were prepared to burn incense to that same "god" again. It is to them that the poet's angry words are addressed.

But you who now strive  
To return past well-being..

The reader milieu of the long poem was unique: in 1969 when it was finished and turned in for publication, it spoke of things that were still well known,

(And by the way, speaking of the uninitiated:  
Where are they? Everyone is initiated...)

but which had been stubbornly hushed up for several years. The whole meaning of the long poem broke this silence and struck a blow against its organizers.

It struck above all by means of what it recalled.

What was said about Stalin here was really just one aspect, although an extremely important one which no one before Tvardovskiy had dealt with so significantly: the theme, examined from many different aspects, of father and son and the theme of the son's responsibility for the father—the real father, by blood, and the man called father—the "father of peoples." (This is the central motif in the poem and, it seems, the most fundamental motif for contemporary consciousness which represents Tvardovskiy's original and final "contribution" to the Stalin theme and demands a special article). But in developing his basic idea, while laying it out, the poet seemed to also lay out a kind of scroll in which the crimes linked to the name of the "universal father" were included. The fate of the peasantry broken by the "Great Turning Point." And the fates of whole peoples "cast into exile." And of those whom the Commander-in-Chief's miscalculations forced to pay double: "From prison to prison—to the thunder of victory To be sent off with a new stigma." And the innumerable other ruined and broken human lives when



By one line of the law  
Fate now equated everyone:  
Son of a kulak or son of a people's commissar,  
Son of an army commander or of a priest...

The stamp from birth marked  
The young of enemy blood.  
And still it seemed that the country  
Did not have enough stigmatized sons.

All this rang out as a double accusation: against the person who committed these crimes and against those who were now trying to wipe away his memory. And the entire final part of Tvardovskiy's triptych "*On Memory*" from the first to the last line struck directly and only against them and against these adherents of oblivion and silence.

This part is rich in the realities of the moment. That "they order to forget." And that in addition they "order silently": nothing is direct and out loud, everything is merely in the language of jests or behind those closed doors which, as is described in another long poem by the same author,

They are all dense and muffled  
In some special way,  
And come out from the wall  
Like a vertical coffin.

And the allusion to the "Chinese model," very meaningful for the time when the "cultural revolution" raged in China—that country's version of our 1937.

Here in every verse is the voice of the editor of *Novyy Mir*; here is a poetic distillation of those arguments which the journal waged on its pages and the voice of its editors who within the walls of the offices mentioned defended the right and duty of literature to speak the truth. And how this voice thunders! Not with the orator's eloquence but with firmness and conviction of the truth:

No, duty today commands to complete  
All the incomplete statements of the past.  
To the curious Komsomol daughter,  
Just try to come to terms with your Glavlit

And who said that grown people  
Must not read certain pages?  
Or that our valor will depart  
And honor in the world will fade?

The poet's angry sarcasm absolutely demolishes those sanctimonious arguments ("when we talk of the past aloud, we only make the enemy happy" and the like) which the "silent ones" of that day usually used (for the lack of any others, the present "silent ones" at times repeat them; and, many of them are the same people). And the conclusion:

Only falsehood cheapens us,  
And only truth should be brought out in public!

And there is the general diagnosis of the "silent ones" themselves, whose startling accuracy is confirmed by all our subsequent development, or rather—stagnation:

He who zealously conceals the past,  
Will hardly be in tune with the future...

One can imagine the threat this long poem would portend if it had been published in 1969! When the force of the blow would be multiplied not only by the national prestige of the country's leading poet and one of its truly great people who knew only one principle—his own conscience—but also by the receptiveness of the reader, who was impatiently awaiting an honest, direct word about what was disturbing and angering him. One can imagine how this small poem would have shaken up human souls which the powers that be had already begun to accustom to an enfeebled idea of permissiveness and of their own helplessness and had already begun to sink into that moral swamp from which we are now trying to extricate ourselves. And how much more difficult this poem would have made the task of the "silent ones" who, step by step, were pushing us into that swamp.

But for some reason they could not allow it.

In front of me are several sheets, without any order, unfortunately, relating to the spring and summer of 1969—little reports on progress in preparing the current issues of *Novyy Mir*. Made up carefully every day by the head of the journal's editorial office N.P. Bianki, they were distributed to all the editorial office workers, which at that time included me. Along with the drafts of the contents of the issues (and in many cases there were two or more of them since pieces held back by Glavlit had to be replaced somehow, at times repeatedly revising the issue), these reports make it possible to trace the poem's journal history through documents.

23 April 1969. The poem is received at the editorial office and sent to the typographer on the very same day for the fifth issue, which had already been set up (report of 24 April). Then by 30 April the editorial office had already received not only the first but also the second proof of the poem.<sup>(11)</sup> However, there was no permission from Glavlit (nor, for that matter, was there a rejection, not to mention a justified one—a frequent situation in the practices of the journal in that day). So as not to delay the issue, the editorial collegium moved the poem to No 6. The same picture: for weeks, months, there was no permission. Finally in the report of 8 July: "The Tvardovskiy verses are replaced by verses of Zlotnikov and Aybek and the verses of African poets." The poem was moved to No 8—the same result. Tvardovskiy fights and before the secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writer's Union insists on a discussion of the poem in the writers' milieu—his words seem to fall on deaf ears. Meanwhile the poem begins to be circulated



and is copied; finally without the author's knowledge it is published abroad. This will be used as a means of moral pressure on the uncompromising editor but does not speed up the poem's appearance in the Soviet press.

And now it is published after 18 years... A contemporary critic (singing the praises of restructuring and of the time 'when it was acknowledged from the highest party tribunes that the cornerstone of socialist democracy had been appreciably corroded in the past') explained the reason for the delay in this way: "The particular drama of the situation which arose in connection with the idea of the poem 'By Right of Memory'... consisted in the fact that at that time public consciousness was not ready to accept such a work. That is why the poem only saw the light 20 years after it was finished by the poet... It is not difficult today to imagine how painful A. Tvardovskiy found the atmosphere of his time; he found himself in the position of a poet 'ahead of his time', as the futurist poets said of themselves. That, it seems, is the point—the unreadiness of public consciousness at that time; the fact that the true poet is typically ahead of his own time while all other people, as he says, 'We were, unfortunately, far from recognizing this corrosion.' And now we ourselves have matured naturally, and some things have been explained to us from the highest tribunes—so here (only now!) Tvardovskiy's poem's time has come. It is somewhat sad, of course, that the poet himself did not manage... and so on, but no one now is to blame, just as they were not 20 and even 10 years ago.

What is there to say about such sad and reassuring explanations (very characteristic in the present conditions for a certain part of the "old guard" of course)? There is hardly anything to say in light of what was stated above. We will only note that even today the "old but terrible weapon" obviously still stabs and burns, if one is compelled to deal with it for the sake of one's own safety.

The main thing, however, is not how the above-mentioned "old guard" greeted the long poem "By Right of Memory" (and a number of other publications which were impossible only yesterday). Their concerns are understandable and are not the question. The real question is this: is this work dear and essential to you "of the other generation," today's youth? Or is this just someone else's history, "pages of the distant past" to you, and you perceive no fundamental link between them and your own life?

All of what was said above is an explanation of Tvardovskiy's poem as a work of our 1960's. This epoch seems to have remained behind glass: close and not to be touched with the hand, and no voices have reached us from there. And suddenly—one and then another such voice which has broken through the thick silence. In order to perceive them one must retune an ear which is out of practice; and in order to enter into a dialog over time, one must recall and understand their forgotten, closed time. But it is important to also perceive the need

for this dialog. After all, the past is valuable to us not so much in itself as a distillation of experience needed today and yesterday. So then, where is the "formula" for this need in relationship to Tvardovskiy's long poem about Stalin? Can this work written a long time ago and the main thing—in specific circumstances already removed by the course of events—somehow be of major service to our present turning point times?

For now let us end with this question.

### Footnotes

1. It was finished in the spring of 1954 but was refused for publication and even served as one of the main (although undeclared) charges against Tvardovskiy which led to his removal for the first time from the post of chief editor of *NOvyy Mir* (23 July 1954). It was published (in a new version) only nine years later and was soon again out of favor for a long time.

2. The creative history of the long poem in its main features is included in M.I. Tvardovskiy's foreword to the publication "By Right of Memory" in *Novyy Mir*. "The indicated period of work on the long poem (1966-1969) is not quite accurate. This is shown by the drafts and entries from the author's notebook given here. He obviously appears to have forgotten the existence of the very first lines, which he had noted down on a page in December 1963 as an idea and then abandoned. Only in July 1965 did the author return to them anew, and then not for long. (...) Tvardovskiy was able to return to the long poem in earnest in 1966. He turned from brief "sittings" (as he called the episodic work) to "assiduity." The long poem was freed of the variation of episodes and took on scope and depth and acquired its polyphonic motifs of speculation "on time and on oneself." It may be said with certainty that the theme of the "five words"—which is central to the long poem—took shape in 1966." Then comes a statement about the inclusion of the poem "In the Hayloft" (*Novyy Mir*, No 1, 1969) in the long poem's text and about the variants of the lyrical foreword to it whose "final edition" expressed the author's decision "to consider 'By Right of Memory' an independent work not formally connected to the pieces which had come out earlier, including the long poem 'The Distance Beyond the Distance'" (*Novyy Mir*, No 3, 1987, pp 163-164).

3. Valeriy Dementyev, "Memory of the Heart. Above the Pages of A.T. Tvardovskiy's Creative Legacy," *Literaturnaya Rossiya*, 24 April 1987.

4. But partly anticipated if one recalls, for example, such facts of the history of literature as the publication in Tvardovskiy's *Novyy Mir* back in 1952 of V. Ovechkin's essays "Humdrum Rayon Life" and in the summer 1953—the first chapters of the long poem "The Distance

*Beyond the Distance*," including the highly critical chapter "Literary Conversation," as the first variant of "Terkin in the Other World" which was mentioned, and others.

5. Recall the equally sharp and unfair criticism by Khrushchev of the almanac *Literaturnaya Moskva* and V. Dudintsev's novel "Not by Bread Alone" (1956), the memoirs of I. Erenburg (1963), and a number of other works of literature and art and the "excommunication" of Pasternak (1958).

6. K. Marx and F. Engels, "Sochineniya" [Works], Vol 8, p 338; Vol 18, p 414.

7. Not always, of course, but only after the need passed—because the object was eliminated—for pogrom speeches like: "What Does Novyy Mir Oppose?" (*Ogonek*, No 30, 1969) or "An Open Letter to the Editor in Chief of the Journal NOVYY MIR Comrade A.T. Tvardovskiy" (*Sotsialisticheskaya Industriya*, 31 July 1969).

8. In the 1930's the journal *Literaturnyy Kritik* (closed in 1940), which courageously and hopelessly fought against illustrativeness in literature, proved to be such a rare

avis. *Novyy Mir* during the first editorship of Tvardovskiy became another such exception to the rule already on the threshold of the new time, in 1952-1954, but it was also cut short in its development. Our literary studies will, God grant, someday take up tracing the interrupted aesthetic baton which passes from the *Krasnaya Nov* of A.K. Voronskiy (1921-1927) through *Litkritika* to the *Novyy Mir* of Tvardovskiy.

9. Although certain elements of opposition could also still be observed for some time in the conduct of 3-4 of our other journals.

10. V.I. Lenin, "Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy" [Complete Works], Vol 21, p 260.

11. Taking advantage of the occasion to note the inaccuracy of the signature under the photograph accompanying the publication of the poem in *Novyy Mir* (No3, 1987, p 191): "The first page of the manuscript of A.T. Tvardovskiy's poem 'By Right of Memory' prepared for print in 1970 (?) in our journal."

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo "Pravda". "Oktyabr". 1987.

12424

## Justice Ministry Answers PRAVDA Article on Training for Judges

### Tivodar Article

18000010a Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 87 p 3

[Article by I. Tivodar, chairman of the Adlerskiy Rayon People's Court: "Who Will Be the Judges?"]

**[Text] The elections of people's judges are approaching. This seems just the time to talk about the pressing problems of forming the corps of judges and their working conditions.**

Judge—is it a profession or a specialization? Strange as it may seem, it is a profession but not at all a specialization; no one anywhere studies to be a judge. The juridical VUZes and analogous schools at universities train lawyers with such a broad profile that they are like multiple lathe operators. A lawyer with a diploma can go to work for the internal affairs organs, the procuracy system, the notary system, Register Office departments, and the practicing bar—each one come as it may. And this is in our day, the day of profound specialization! It is somehow uncomfortable to write about the fact that the judge's work differs greatly from the above-enumerated positions and requires detailed mastery of its specific features. But if we cannot equate a specialization and a profession, then we must recognize that the problem of replacing judicial personnel has become very acute. This is even more true because roughly one-fourth of the almost 15,000 candidates in the upcoming elections have been recommended for judicial work for the first time.

Who will be the judges? People who have worked a while in legal consultation offices, in the militia, as secretaries of court sessions—as long as they have a higher legal degree. But the diploma says nothing about the calling, the purely human qualities, knowledge of psychology—all that set and organic blend of features without which the path to the judge's bench is impossible.

In short, the time has come for the VUZes to train not simply lawyers, but lawyers with a future work profile, including future people's judges. This will minimize the period of apprenticeship, which at present can be very considerable. The responsibility of a judge is not like that of an apprentice or journeyman, after all; it is the responsibility of the master, for he is entrusted to decide people's fates. The process of "acclimatization" to such a difficult position is further complicated because the judge's work is not properly organized.

What kind of workload should the judge have? This simple question does not appear to have an answer today. The courts have an 8-hour working day, but who slaves over the papers in the evenings and on days off? The people's judge. When he was in second grade my son

stunned me with the question: "Daddy, you're a lagging worker, aren't you? Our teacher only gives extra work to the lagging ones. And you spend every evening with your papers..."

In fact, I cannot recall a single evening or day off when I did not have court papers to work on.

This is improbable, but a judge often does not have time to become familiar with new legal developments, keep up with innovations, and improve his professional and cultural level. Add to this propaganda for legal knowledge, prevention of crime, and public work.

It is urgently necessary to regulate the judge's work. How much can we do in the old way! Is it really that hard for scientists to work out recommendations on the optimal workload with due regard for the volume and complexity of the cases and the number of defendants and witnesses? After all, some trials take many months. The judge's responsibility for his other cases is not removed; they too must be heard within the established time. And it must be done well! This is an axiom of the judicial system.

There is nothing good to say about the technical equipment that judges have at their disposal. Just as in our grandfathers' day the primary tools are paper and pen; we are even short of typewriters, and there is no need to even mention computers, displays, and electronic memory. If they are out of date even at the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Courts and there is not a suggestion of modern equipment, why even mention the rayon courts?

In our court we have five people's judges, but only three typewriters and no duplicating machine; being without it is like having no hands. I recently had a tough "case"; the trial lasted more than a week, and the verdict took up 30 typewritten pages. There were 7 defendants in the case, and at least 7 copies are required for each of them—this means almost 1,500 pages. It took three days just to print up copies.

The physical evidence of crimes and inspections of the sites of incidents are recorded on film. But the people's judge has nowhere to watch the film. We have neither a film room nor a projector; the court building was constructed according to an obsolete plan. We do not have dictaphones or tape recorders; the only records made are of the examination of defendants and the testimony of witnesses. The speeches of the state prosecutor and the defense attorney are not recorded. Higher-ranking organs cannot make any evaluation of them, even though both the prosecution and the defense have their own carefully thought-out arguments which the court has the right to agree with or reject; but then the rejection must be supported by reasoning so that the verdict is more convincing. Recording on tape will help avoid excess writing too and save time and money. The application of technical equipment will discipline all participants in the trial.

We must resolutely overturn the current organization of the people's judge's work and get rid of the huge amount of unproductive labor. We fill more pages with handwriting in a day that many typists will use. I can say for myself that I write so much in a day that toward evening my hand becomes numb. The indictment is repeated literally word-for-word in the declarative part of the verdict and in the preamble. The substantiation of the verdict again involves abundant citations of material from the investigation. The judge turns into a copying clerk. I think that all this could be reduced to one-half or one-fifth of the time now spent without detriment to the quality of proof and substantiation of the verdict.

The court is not just judges. There are also the secretaries of court sessions and court executors. No one trains people for these positions either. Our country has thousands of vocational-technical schools, but not a single one with a legal specialization, even though there is an enormous need for these specialists, as well as for court archivists.

I do not know how it is in other courts, but our court reminds me of a permanent school for improving qualifications. The court executors and secretaries of court sessions must be trained from the beginning. The people's assessors must be familiarized with the law and court procedures, and not on an amateur level either, or they will not be helpful. No sooner have they gotten used to things than they are replaced and the teaching cycle starts over.

A time of changes has also come for the institution of people's assessors, who under the law have identical rights as the judge. The rights are the same, but the responsibilities are different. If a mistake is made the judge is held strictly accountable, and the assessors are not even mentioned. The decision is made collectively, in chambers, but it appears that the responsibility is all on one person?!

The people's assessors are usually highly respected and authoritative people, each in his own sector; but during the trial we elevate amateurs to the rank of professionals. They are not even assistants; they are full-fledged judges. A nurse without special training will never assist a surgeon; in the most difficult operations the assistants may even be candidates of sciences. Is the court process really any less delicate than surgery? In both cases we are talking about a person's fate. How can we entrust it to a non-specialist?

Whether we want it or not the times powerfully demand that only people professionally trained for the work should be judges. We have already done this at the highest levels of the judicial system; in the Supreme Courts appeals are heard by a panel of three members of the Supreme Court, and the institution of people's assessors functions in the Supreme Courts only when trial matters are being heard.

The reader cannot help wondering: is the author then in favor of increasing the number of judges, of having three judges at a trial? What advantage is there in that? Let us figure it out. A rayon court has 75 assessors, multiply this number by 10—they are taken away from their primary functions for 750 working days with pay; in other words it costs as much to support them as 3 judges earn. When the trial is conducted by three specialists subjectivism and prejudice are reduced to a minimum.

The demands made of the corps of judges are increasing, and this is one of the signs of the times. But we need restructuring in many ways for the people's judge to fit the times. Some of these ways were discussed in this article. They do not require large expenditures, and they promise a tangible benefit.

#### Justice Ministry's Response

18000010b Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 87 p 3

[Letters from readers: "We Continue Our Discussion of the Article 'Who Will Be the Judges?'" ]

[Text] Each piece in the newspaper on a legal topic arouses a massive response from readers. The article "Who Will Be the Judges" by Adlerovskiy Rayon Judge I. Tivodar, published on 10 June 1987 was no exception. Today we are publishing excerpts from letters whose authors reflect on how to improve the work of the people's courts.

#### F. Belousov, lawyer, Irkutsk:

I. Tivodar is right: a broadly trained lawyer is still not a judge. But when and where will he become one? I think it will only be in law classes, either daytime or by extension. And of course, this is on the condition that the student already has a higher legal education and work experience in the specialization. In this connection, it seems to me that the elections for people's judges need to be held 3-4 months before the term of the preceding judges expires. There is a reason for this. The newly elected judge will have an opportunity to take specialized classes and will come to work prepared.

#### Yu. Bubentsov, Borovichi, Novgorod Oblast:

Specialization of lawyers is necessary, but not until after completing school. After all, as long as we follow the elective principle for judges it is easy to predict the situation where a graduate who has been trained to be a judge will not be elected.

#### Ye. Grechko, Kharkov:

We should not play at democratization by electing judges. After all, what does the voter know about the candidates? Only their biographies. Because they lack legal training it is difficult for the voters to judge the professional level of the candidate. And the candidate cannot come out with his own platform, because all his actions

are regulated by law. Furthermore, the questions of releasing judges are decided in justice departments. We should let these same organs elect the judges: they have everything they need for this.

**N. Shoyev, Abakan:**

Many thousands of people's assessors were elected in the country this year. As a rule they are production leaders and the losses from taking them out of socially useful labor run into the millions of rubles. At the same time veterans councils have now been established. They include many heroes of the war and labor and party veterans. They all have a great deal of life experience. Why wouldn't these be the very ones to elect as people's assessors? I think that the legal system and society would only gain from this.

**P. Shevchenko, people's assessor, Volgograd Oblast:**

A judge is elected for 5 years and a people's assessor for 2.5 years. I think this is a mistake. After all, in this time the assessor is just getting familiar with things and beginning to be a real help to the judge. Moreover, I think that the judge needs to be given the right to put the question to the labor collective of recalling a people's assessor if he is not conscientious and is not active in performing his public work in the court.

**A. Maslov, head of legal consultation, Zyryanskoye Village, Tomsk Oblast:**

The trouble with our people's assessors is not that they do not know the laws well or that they lack life experience. Their problem is more in the fact that they still have not gotten used to firmly defending their own point of view in each particular case and are by no means always principled enough. This is also the trouble with some of our judges. Not all of them firmly resist the influence of local governmental organs and officials. It seems to me that in the current phase of restructuring the first thing we, the lawyers, must do for the work of the court organs is to restructure ourselves: be more honest, principled, independent, and just.

**V. Kuryata, trial attorney, Rovno:**

The "pure" lawyer generally feels like a schoolboy among all the accounting, commodity, technological, and other expert reports, work position instructions, and departmental orders. This is where people's assessors are needed for the court to do a complete job. But they should be enlisted as assessors on the basis of their knowledge of the sector which the particular case concerns, not simply by order in line, as is done now.

**V. Sazonov, Penza:**

The time has long since arrived to create normal working conditions for judges and provide them with modern office equipment. I may be mistaken, but I have the impression that the USSR Ministry of Justice does not have an interest in supplying judges with tape recorders, video equipment, and other means because they will record the infractions, crudeness, and tactlessness of participants in the court trial, their prejudice and favoritism for the prosecution.

**D. Serova, Vladivostok:**

I agree that there is a lot of superfluous writing by hand in the court. For example, the verdict itself takes 5-6 lines, and all the rest is a detailed restatement of the indictment. But why repeat that which has already been established by the materials of the case? The verdict, in my opinion, should include only what has been disclosed during the trial and omitted or not proven by the investigation.

**Official Response**

**M. Vyshinskiy, USSR deputy minister of justice:**

The USSR Ministry of Justice has reviewed I. Tivodar's article "Who Will Be the Judges?" The problems it raises and the suggestions made there are very timely.

The USSR Ministry of Justice believes that future judges should be trained with deepened specialized teaching in the upper classes. The organizational form here should be court-procurator-investigation specialization, but with a radical updating of its content. Thus, it is proposed to increase the length of the practical training experience of students at court jobs to 1 year.

In addition, the ministry has worked out a system of advanced study for legal scholars who are recommended for court work, and it is envisioned that, before they are elected to be people's judges, graduates of juridical VUZes will be used in special positions involved with hearing particular categories of simple cases.

Comrade Tivodar's concern with shortcomings in providing qualified cadres to the apparatus of the people's courts is justified. Despite the efforts being made by the Ministry of Justice, however, the decisions of directive organs on organizing secondary juridical schools are not being carried out in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and in other republics.

The stark statement by the author of the article on the question of judges' working conditions is justified. Indeed, judges today are overloaded. They do not have the necessary amount of elementary office equipment, and 2,204 courts are housed in drafty, dangerous buildings or buildings that do not meet minimum procedural

requirements. The problem of freeing judges from superfluous paperwork has also come to a head. The author's proposal that criminal and other court cases be heard only by professional judges without participation by people's assessors contradicts the fundamental political-legal principles of organization of the socialist legal system and cannot be supported. At the same time the USSR Ministry of Justice is working to prepare legislative and other proposals aimed at strengthening the role of people's assessors in the legal process and improving their legal training. 11176

**Merits of Paid Versus Free Health Care Debated**  
*18120022 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 44, 8-15 Nov 87 p 10*

[Interview with B. V. Rakitsky, D. Sc. (Economics), Vice-President of the Soviet Sociological Association and V. M. Rutgaizer, D. Sc. (Economics), head of the department of social problems and well-being of the Economic Research Institute at the USSR State Planning Committee, arranged by Yevgeniya Albats; date and place not given: "The Cost of Humanism and the Price of An Illusion"; first three paragraphs are introductory paragraphs; passages in boldface as published]

[Text] Last summer we featured two items dealing with the financial foundation of our health care system. In issue No 26 we featured an interview with Academician Yevgeny Chazov, Minister of Public Health of the USSR; in issue No 35—the article "Paying for Health" about the opening of the first paying general hospital in Moscow. We expected the discussion to be continued. Reality outstripped us: many of the questions taken up on MN pages were slated for decision in the published draft project for restructuring the health care system.

The mail received in response to these publications was abundant and, to a certain extent, unexpected. All readers without exception believe that our public health system is very far from ideal. Only three letters supported the idea of organizing charitable aid for medicine. Among them is dramatist G. S. Ryabkin of Leningrad, who sent to the Minister of Public Health a postal order for 1,000 roubles—"so that the idea should be translated into reality as quickly as possible." (We should point out that the Fund for the Development of Zoos has found many more supporters.) A small faction even approved the paid hospital dinner ("by incurring additional expenditures for their treatment at the hospital, patients will also be more exacting regarding general service: now that is being paralyzed by being offered free as a kind of 'charity' on the part of the hospital in relation to the patient"—L. Liss, Novosibirsk).

The absolute majority of readers were **against** all aspects requiring payment in public health. Well, the mail mirrors society's real sentiment. For this reason we turned to B. V. Rakitsky, D. Sc. (Economics), Vice-President of the Soviet Sociological Association, and V. M. Rutgaizer, D. Sc. (Economics), head of the department of social

problems and well-being of the Economic Research Institute at the USSR State Planning Committee, inviting them to enter into dialogue with readers.

**The first and most widely used argument against payment: "There is going to be profit, but whether there is going to be better treatment is still questionable." (A. Kotelnikov, Moscow Region).**

**Rutgaizer:** True. Remember, they raised the prices of air tickets, promising greater comfort—is it any better? They added one or two kopeks to transport fares. Are trolley-buses less crowded now? No. On the other hand, our purses have become thinner to the tune of these very same kopeks and roubles, and our real wages—lower accordingly. The same goes for public health. All novel developments will turn out to be hollow, entailing new burdens for us unless we reorganize this sphere in the most radical way: the 19 billion roubles, which now add up to the budget of free medical aid, are being spent most unwisely. If we add to this ineffective system not just five times more, as it is proposed to do by the year 2000, but 20 times more, i.e., as much as the Americans spend, the system will simply gulp this down. That is why we are so zealous in advocating the introduction of cost accounting in health care, which will make its mechanisms work better while preserving the principles of free medical aid. That is why we speak about the need to tariff every kind of operation in medicine—in regard to both complexity and expenses—which will make it possible to apply crystal-clear criteria for assessing the professional level of doctors instead of the foggy "good-bad." The example of the Intrasectoral Research Complex of Microsurgery of the Eye, which has been the first to go over to performance on the profit-and-loss basis, is the best proof of this effect.

**Does it mean that reader D. Zhukov of Moscow is right in believing that "paying hospitals are the easiest and most half-hearted solution to problems facing our health care system"?**

**Rutgaizer:** No. Because there is a need to take a sober look at things and search for different solutions. First, such a bulky and cumbersome thing as the health care system will not be turned round by one stroke, whereas paying hospitals will take over part of the patients and thereby lessen the queues at ordinary hospitals and polyclinics. Second, there are limitations on the resources of the economy, which also dictate the size of deductions for medicine. Third—and this, I believe, is the main thing—people must have **freedom of choice**. Life is not a barracks in which "I am like everyone else". If I work better and, accordingly, receive more, it is up to me how I spend my money: on a sideboard or more comfortable conditions in hospital. This is normal.

**"But what about social equality?"—this is the second serious argument "against". "Isn't there a smell of hospitals for 'poor' and 'rich'?" writes reader A. Shvyrkova of Leningrad. "And what about the gains of the October**

**Revolution, who has given you the right to cancel them?" "Grabbers and bribe takers alone will be able to pay for medical treatment" (A. Nikiforov, Moscow).**

**Rakitsky:** First and foremost—no one has cancelled, nor is going to cancel, free medical aid. It is guaranteed to all citizens of the country. The social consumption funds are, as before, the main source of income for medicine. The idea is that additional paid medical services will be developed alongside free medical aid. There is not going to be, nor can there be, any sacrilege in relation to the gains of the October Revolution.

We are not talking along the right lines. As I see it, we have acquired a false notion of what social justice actually is. It is often taken as equalitarianism which, in effect amounts to the greatest injustice. Look: one worker is fulfilling the plan, another is wasting his time. They create different quantities of the product, part of which goes into the formation of social consumption funds. One, roughly speaking, contributed a rouble, the other—fifty kopeks. But they have equal access to the social funds. The negligent lives at the expense of the diligent? This, I believe, is called exploitation.

**Rutgaizer:** As far as "hospitals for the poor and rich" are concerned, sociological studies bear witness to the following: it is mostly people with average and even minimum earnings that come to the cost-accounting, i.e., paying polyclinics. Because normal—I accentuate: normal—free health care is more than they can afford. The research carried out by T. Koryakina, a Professor at our Institute, has shown that even at the most conservative estimates the earnings of "shadow" medicine today amount to two to three billion roubles—almost a seventh of the present-day budget of the health care system! I don't want to say that all doctors take money, but it's a fact that it is a fairly widespread phenomenon. So that free medicine in conditions of deficit (and paid services are called upon to diminish it) does not at all guarantee equality. On the contrary, it adds to inequality because it gives rise to some health care oases (created, as a matter of fact, from the same social consumption funds) and thereby divides people not into those who work well or badly, but into those who belong to a government department and who don't.

Almost every letter is about how much has to be paid in the hospital and what for. "A rouble to the nurse, five roubles to the trained nurse, who will otherwise not even give you the medicine prescribed by the doctor, tens of roubles—to the doctor" (A. Nikiforov of Moscow, Zorin of Samarkand, etc.). This is most surprising: they agree to pay illegally, but do not agree to pay officially...

**Rutgaizer:** There was a hope that administrative measures would put an end to extortions...

**Rakitsky:** I believe that the reason is different, namely, that mass consciousness was constantly divided in halves. It was hammered home to people that whatever

it's like, it's still free health care. And this health care was palmed off as social justice. People were persuaded that all was well despite the existence of separate shortcomings. They became convinced. Among themselves they used to say: "what disgraceful things are going on in our polyclinics", but they thought: "it is only with us that things are bad, but elsewhere (the papers wrote about this!) they are good in general..."

In short, for a long time we were used to considering the abnormal as normal, while taking microscopic improvements as a step forward. The result is that the hitherto concealed deformations of social consciousness have come to the surface today, being expressed, among other things, in the established habit of rearing everything new—either in everyday life or in production. Hence, the natural reaction: don't! We have what we are used to—even if it is old and bad—we lived and rejoiced with it, but we do not know whether we shall be better off with the new...

**And yet you will agree that there is a definite category of people for whom even poor free health care is a boon. In Novosibirsk a group under Academician Tatyana Zaslavskaya carried out a research study (its results have been published) which showed: 8.8 per cent of the country's population do not hold out from payday to payday, the wages of 24.2 per cent are enough only to pay for the necessities. "I can afford four roubles a day," writes pensioner S. Polyakov of Moscow, "my wife—2.4 roubles, and many other pensioners have even less. You say: 'Pay for your health', but if I cannot afford it?"**

**Rutgaizer:** The problem of people with scanty means is a comprehensive one and has to be solved by special programmes.

**Rakitsky:** There is a need to prepare people for change. Today the press features a great deal of negative facts. This is wonderful. However, there is also a need for the next step, namely, the search for answers to much more complicated questions: why are things bad? Since when have they become so bad? What is the reason? This is the kind of search we do not always dare to undertake. But Marx said: "To be radical means to understand the thing in its root."

/09599

#### **Need for Protection of Uzbek Children's Health Noted**

*18120013a Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
6-13 Sep 87 p 13*

[Article by Andrei Pralnikov]

[Text] Several hundred people had gathered at the surgical centre in Tashkent. Yevgeny Chazov, Minister of Public Health of the USSR, opened the visiting session of the Ministry's collegium by saying: "This is an unprecedented meeting—there has been nothing like it in the history of our medicine."

There has also been nothing like it in terms of a number of participants or in how the audience applauded the speakers. But, above all, it was unprecedented in its theme. The only item on the agenda was: on grave shortcomings in the organization of treatment and disease-prevention help to mothers and children of an early age in the Uzbek SSR and measures to rectify the situation. What then, were they applauding in Tashkent, sizzling in the +46C heat?

After **Alexander Baranov**, his deputy, made the report, the Minister took the floor again:

"We don't assess speeches in this way at the collegium meetings. But I'd applaud the physicians who came here from all over the country to help children and their own colleagues, at the expense of their vacations."

The audience burst into prolonged applause again.

I spent several days travelling all over Uzbekistan, reading documents, reports and references and talking with physicians, so I was prepared for what I'd hear at the collegium. As a lay person, what I found out about the problem, or, to be more accurate, problems, stunned me. At the time, the Draft Guidelines for the Development of the Population's Health Protection and the Restructuring of the USSR Health Protection System in the 12th Five-Year Plan and in the Period till 2000, which has named the shortcomings and recognized them as inflicting considerable damage to the Party's social policy and society's progress on the whole, wasn't published as yet. Therefore, I could hardly grasp everything I saw and heard.

We've grown used to the pretty phrase that the USSR has but one privileged class—children, to whom we give the best we have. And today people were shocked by the following sentence in the Draft: "The state of work on health protection of mother and child causes special anxiety." It turns out that for a certain time the infant mortality rate was being lowered through all sorts of paper tricks in reports, while in reality it was mounting. Now emergency measures are needed—in this indicator some of Uzbekistan's districts are neighbouring on Paraguay and Thailand.

A large batch of antibiotics and hormonal preparations was sent to Central Asia. In July 240 teams of physicians, medical nurses, and senior-year students from medical institutes, who are doing state practical work, arrived there. As many as 150 teams went all over Uzbekistan. The infant mortality rate started falling at the most unfavourable time for the region, when the disease rate usually jumps tens of times. But is that a way out—to make many hundreds of people work on a shift basis? This is more like an extraordinary emergency measure.

Nikolai Vaganov, who was responsible for preparing materials for the Tashkent collegium, thinks that there's a need to tackle the affair from all sides at once. To make

maximum use of the money it was decided to allocate much more on mother-and-child-protection than in the past five-year plans, build and repair hospitals and maternity wards and purchase equipment, send experienced physicians to Uzbekistan, and send Uzbek students to other medical institutes of the country (because as one of the Ministry's workers once said, they should not get used to the fact that the water from the sewerage is poured on the resuscitation patients). That, of course, is a bit of an exaggeration, because the majority of infectious diseases hospitals in the Republic have no plumbing at all.

A family-planning service is absolutely imperative: the babies after the fifth or sixth births come weakened, they are often ill and it is much harder for the physicians to look after them. One of the reasons for the high infant mortality rate is that mothers apply to the doctors too late. If a baby falls ill they come up against a choice: either to go into hospital together with the baby, leaving six-seven children, each a year younger, at home, or to hope that somehow it will all end well. But to date there is no help in family planning. This is true even among medical workers. The majority of children's doctors and gynecologists are women and in Nukus, for example, nearly half of them are permanently on maternity leave or looking after their own ill children. We walked down the gangway at the red-hot airfield in Nukus. Delavar Kabulova, deputy Minister of Public Health of Uzbekistan; Alexander Baranov, Deputy Minister of Public Health of the USSR, and Alexander Kondrusyov, chief of the Main Sanitary-Epidemiological Administration, discussed the situation with the city's maternity hospital. Its crowded building, built many years ago, should have been closed for repairs, because the conditions in it became simply impermissible. It was decided to hospitalize the women ready to give birth at the medical centre of a production organization which has another nice facility in Tashkent. But this "arbitrariness" of the Public Health Ministry offended the leadership of the Kara-Kalpak ASSR. All sorts of explanations started and references were made to workers' complaints. "But if the workers could be shown in what conditions their wives bear children, there'd not be any protests!" Kabulova said angrily.

We were taken to an out-of-town house for VIPs. It was air-conditioned, had big rooms, baths (for some reason with rugs on the floor), and a reception hall. A country house and a nice atmosphere. I suppose a maternity home or a hospital could fit in quite well there. However, such ideas haven't yet become widespread in Kara-Kalpakia.

The next day we travelled alongside the Amudarya, formerly a great river of Central Asia, towards the ancient Khiva. It is "formerly" great because nowadays its water practically doesn't reach the Aral Sea, getting used up in cotton fields and rice paddies. The Aral Sea is becoming catastrophically shallower, and the climate is getting spoiled. Pesticides and fertilizers pollute the



river, so do industrial wastes and urban sewage. On the Kara-Kalpakia territory the Amudarya water is already not fit for drinking. All that doesn't add to people's health, which, as we know, depends mainly not on medical aid as on conditions and way of life, food and water.

Alexander Kondrusyov mentioned figures—if the building of water-supply systems continues at today's rate, then the percentage of the Uzbekistan population which uses good drinking water will go down from 50 to 32 per cent—the Republic's population grows very quickly.

A sanitary doctor can control the quality of water and food, can work to make industrial enterprises reduce their harmful pollutions, and can even close down an enterprise which doesn't obey him. But he cannot build. Health protection is not the concern of the physicians alone. It is the concern of all the economic and public organizations without exception.

One sees this at the most diverse levels: from large-scale measures on improving the environment to small facts, which seem so insignificant on this background, which we met during our trip. On many farms, for the sake of economy, the electricity was periodically switched off. This led to the sera, stored in refrigerators, becoming unfit for use and, thus, to the death of babies.<sup>b</sup> The physicians who came to help children in Uzbekistan, sent reports to Tashkent on their work, on the quality of medical services in the districts. The reports contain common proposals. Staff members of the Pediatrics Research Institute of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences recommend that there should be proposals on how to increase the responsibility of collective farm leaders for infant mortality. Nikolai Bilenko, assistant from the pediatrics department, who came to the Dzhi-zak Region from Krasnodar, from the Kuban Medical Institute, proposes that something like a public competence test be introduced for chief physicians of rural hospitals—their authority will grow and there will be less chance people at such posts.

Lyudmila Nikolayeva from the Perm Medical Institute wrote that she did a study of goods for children at the shops in Tamdy District. She didn't find anything, except sets for new-born babies, and in the food shops—\*only the Detolakt mix, which was outdated. None of the parents of babies suffering from acute gastric infections could cook gruels. They had to be taught how to do it.

Seventy-eight delegated medical workers are working in the Bukhara Region. Emma Zhuravets from Voronezh said that their team was receiving patients round the clock, helping both children and adults. She had to complain—only five litres of gasoline were allotted per car per day!

In the Koshkupy District hospital, which we visited en route to Khiva, the doctors complained that there was no oxygen—they had to borrow cylinders of technical oxygen from local builders. The regional children's hospital in Khorezm is considered to be normal, but it is also overcrowded—305 beds instead of the 180 planned. There is no enough equipment and medicines. The regional maternity hospital has no diagnostics equipment.

This kind of situation did not form all of a sudden. During the last five-year plans an insignificant share of the health protection budget was allotted to help children: some 1 per cent of all purchases abroad (and this is when our own medical industry is lagging hopelessly,) some 10 per cent of the money for capital construction, etc. Many of the institutes and schools are providing poor training for doctors and nurses. In Fergana, for example, the regional competence test commission saw 130 people in just two of its sessions—what sort of a checkup on knowledge can we talk about?

Many polyclinics, children's hospitals and maternity hospitals are located in so-called adapted buildings. How well they are "adapted" we can judge, for example, by a polyclinic in Tashkent—a barrack built after the 1966 earthquake. Most of the rural clinics do not even have a telephone. "Mother and child care was not underrated, it was simply ignored," Yevgeny Chazov said. "I couldn't imagine such a situation. We discovered colossal shortcomings in the organization of the most important branch of health protection. I could never imagine obstetricians-gynecologists with diplomas who would not be able to operate. But in the Republic there are over 70 per cent of them."

People spoke of many other facts at the collegium session and at the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, where the Party and economic management activists got together. The collegium adopted a decision which sets out what measures should be taken and when to rectify the situation.

They also deal with the increase in the number of hospital beds, with a sharp increase in their cost which means that they'll be of better quality. The money allocated for free feeding of children will be increased several times. The deficit of modern technology and medicines will be reduced. It was decided to make one of the Republican hospitals a children's hospital. The training of medical students will be improved.

A much greater part of the budget of the USSR Ministry of Public Health is now being allotted for protection of children's health, but apparently it must be even bigger than the average for Uzbekistan and other emergency areas. The children's doctors are of the opinion that a special children's health programme must be elaborated—then it will be easier to rid the generations to come of our maladies, which is the society's main task.

The doctors at the auditorium of the Tashkent centre applauded not only the practical and clear words in the decision taken by the Ministry's collegium. They know better than the others how difficult the situation is and how much work is to be done to reconstruct the health services. They applauded glasnost after so many years of silence, euphemisms and all sorts of hiding real facts. The Draft, published for nationwide discussion, called for a spade a spade—and even used cruel words when speaking of life and death, especially of children's life and death.

But this cruel truth is necessary. Even the physicians who came to help their colleagues, and even the Minister who confessed that he couldn't even imagine some of the things, didn't know all of it. The Party and the state consider the protection and strengthening of Soviet people's health to be the most important things. The more important things can be solved only publicly.

Physicians from Russia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and the Baltic Republics will come to Central Asia again next year. They'll come to do a very hard job—to heal, to save.

/06662b

#### **Extremist Crimean Tatars Criticized, Positive Changes Marked**

18120013b Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English  
25 Oct-1 Nov 87 p 4

[Text] How and why did the act, loudly designated by the extremist-minded people of Crimean Tatar nationality "A foot campaign to the Crimea", not take place?

The regional newspaper KRYMSKAYA PRAVDA told about his abortive attempt and provided an assessment of what happened. At the request of MN, Mikhail Bakharev, the paper's deputy editor, comments on what happened at the time.

Let's start with the events preceding the "campaign". A meeting was held on Sunday, October 4, in the Sovetsky settlement, 100 km from Simferopol. It was organized by the same people. I must say at once that no requests were filed before that a local Soviets top hold any sort of meetings or demonstrations. But the authorities did not hinder them.

From the speeches it became clear that the act was preplanned and preorganized. Text of appeals and statements written before were read out. The slogans on glasnost and democracy were introduced in between.

The same happened that day in some other population points. Arguments of reason and facts showing positive changes were categorically rejected. They were rejected in spite of the fact that in reply to the requests of the Crimean Tatars on the recreation of the Autonomous Republic, a state commission was set up headed by

Andrei Gromyko, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The commission studied the situation on the spot. The results of its work are to be made public.

In the meanwhile it is already possible today to speak of the fulfillment of many requests and wishes of the Crimean Tatars. The national group Khaitarma toured the region recently, the requests were fulfilled for subscribing to the periodicals published in the Crimean Tatar language, and their sales were expanded and soon those who wish to do so will be able to study (optionally) the Crimean Tatar language in general secondary schools. In short, one has to try very hard not to see the changes taking place recently.

Some of the leaders want only too clearly to get into a confrontation. This is being done under any pretext. For example, in Skalistoye Village of the Bakhchisarai District the people decided to unveil secretly, without permission, a plague with the names of Tatars shot by nazis. Would anyone have thought such a monument not useful if it were done stealthily? I'm sure that not only Tatars, but Russians, Ukrainians, Byelorussians and people of many other nationalities who live today in the Crimea, would have come to such a meeting.

Now about the campaign. The organizers planned to march to the peninsula from the Kuban, cross it and finish the march in Simferopol. It should be noted that the region had been closed due to the danger of spread of epidemics among some animals. Due to that the influx of cars and private citizens was limited temporarily. When this was being explained to the marchers at the approach to the ferry from the Krasnodar Territory to the Crimean Peninsula, it all ended in an outburst of hooliganism—some 300 people started to break windows in the buses and to act insubordinately to the militiamen who were trying to restore order.

Who are the initiators of campaigns, marches and underground meetings? Bekir Umerov—he has all the grounds to consider himself to be one of the main figures in what is happening now. *Literaturnaya Gazeta* wrote about him in the article "Journey of Mister Byrnes". Soviet TV showed the rendezvous of Umerov with the First Secretary of the US Embassy in the USSR. The New York press gave this most aggressive extremist Crimean Tatar broad publicity, publishing a proclamation of the religious-political sect—Unification Church—set up by Moon, the well-known anti-Communist. Eldar Shabanov, another extremist "figure", is of the same kind. He is not averse to appealing to the West in his nationalistic claims. Another leader is Reshat Osmanov. Recently the Procurator's Office issued a warning to him for instigating people to commit group acts of antisocial behaviour, and also of holding meetings and marches not permitted by the authorities. Other extremist leaders living in the Crimea are Mamedye Chobanov, Bekir Kurtosmanov, Sadyk Berberov and Shukri Nafeyev.

Their energy could be used for beneficial work.

/06662

**Journalist Views Changing Role of Soviet Family**  
*18300039a Moscow OGONEK in Russian No 37, Sep 87 pp 6-8*

[Article by Tamara Afanasyeva: "Good Intentions"]

[Text] Recently children got their own account at the USSR State Bank: Account #707, the Fund imeni V. I. Lenin. Recently various funds have been springing up with frightening rapidity, since each one signifies an unfortunate situation in some sphere of our lives or in some region of our country. The Chernobyl Fund, the collection of donations for victims of natural disasters in Georgia, the Cultural Fund, the Zoo Aid Fund... Previous decisions relating to the organization of the collection of donations were brought up and adopted in the same way by everyone.

Surprisingly, the latest one has aroused controversy. Quite frankly, the author of this article also has conflicting emotions about it. On the one hand, how could there be any doubt about aid to children, needy large families, orphans and wards of children's homes? Yes, of course we all need to help them, from the heart, and not just with money, but also with our participation and actions. But on the other hand a sense of alarm: what does that mean? Children in trouble? Do we have so many children that society is incapable of supplying them with all they need out of state coffers? Of course not. In fact, demographers are sounding the alarm: the birth rate has fallen to a critical level in such large republics as the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Belorussia.

The growing number of "unwanted" children, orphans taken away from unfit parents and a large number of congenitally handicapped children: all these shocking, heartrending scenes attest to a deep-rooted illness in the family, the basic unit of society. To its abnormal position as compared with other social institutions.

Here are some data published recently in *Uchitel'skaya Gazeta*, in an interview with A. Korobeynikov, USSR deputy minister of education. In our country there are over 15 million incomplete families (single mothers, divorced families and widows with children). Throughout the country as a whole one-child families comprise 50 percent of the total number of families (and 58 percent in the RSFSR). Fact: one pregnancy in three ends in abortion. The number of girls under the age of 16 who are bearing children or having abortions is growing rapidly. What more proof is needed that the family is experiencing a serious crisis?

Sociologists link the failure of families with such socially harmful phenomena as alcoholism (it is both the cause and the result of domestic difficulties), drug addiction

and prostitution. Unfortunate children are the result of all this. And they, when they are older and more experienced, will themselves bear a new generation carrying the genes of misfortune.

So what will this new public organization be treating primarily: the cause or the symptom?

Judging by the programmatic speech delivered by writer A. Likhanov, the chairman of the Children's Fund's organizational committee, attention will be focused on the family.

Of course, a statement by the chairman of an organizational committee is one thing and actually doing something is another. The committee's very first measures indicate that the family is going to play a very minor role in its work. In the original government resolution on the Children's Fund the family is mentioned only in passing, and in the draft version of the fund's charter assistance to the family is at the bottom of a list of expenses.

And so that is what is being reinforced in the public consciousness and in the fund's documents; once again "a social blow to the family may be dealt under the guise of social advantage" (an expression used by A. Likhanov to describe past actions by the state). For the present pitiful state of the family and children was not brought about intentionally.

Several generations have already grown up firmly convinced that a family is like a severe prison sentence, from which women in particular must be liberated, since they are the ones primarily affected by it. The family is a cheerless existence, a philistine swamp, the final refuge of private property ambitions. Authoritative scientists such as academician S. Strumilin have asserted that the state, when it grows stronger, will take upon itself the task of caring for the next generation "from the cradle to the university," since the family is a poor teacher. The family has been assailed from all quarters: by philosophers, economists, production managers, writers and moviemakers. In addition, for a long time the individual with his needs, interests, joys and sorrows became the MEANS of social development rather than the GOAL of that development; physical production was transformed from a means of supporting and improving life and the individual into an end in itself. Our system of values for living was like a pyramid turned upside down. Hence our attitude that the needs of individuals and families are losses for society rather than gains. Hence the origin of the "leftover principle" with regard to the allocation of national income, according to which only little scraps of construction, industry, agriculture, defense and science were budgeted to meet day-to-day needs. And children got the leftovers from these leftovers (they are "dependent consumers," as they produce no commodities).

However, in a country with insufficient population saving money on children and the family is an unpardonable luxury even from a purely mercantile point of view. Fact:

by the age of 35 a normal individual who is neither an invalid nor a criminal will already have fully paid off all the money spent on him by society, past and future — up until the day he dies. At that age the individual begins to contribute to the common wealth and to future prosperity. Thus, the current change of the economic course in the direction of the individual is not so much a tribute to humanistic aspirations as it is an alignment of the economy with the NORM, a realization that a good family with many children adds to the strength of society rather than exhausting it, as is still believed by some of those who distribute the wealth, whose intellectual and professional blindness has led to a shameful situation in the way our country protects the health and well-being of mothers and children, and that in the country which has the greatest number of physicians per capita in the world. It appears that in health care as well children have come to be regarded as secondary when there is a shortage of personnel or money. And once again, if our pyramid of values were not inverted, we could "calculate" as follows: the more money we invest in mothers and children, the less illnesses adults will have. But in order to do this we need to think in different terms than those used by timer-serving bureaucrats.

I recall how 10 years ago, after the publication in *Nedelya* of a series of articles in which I attempted to interpret objectively the unchanging role of mothers and fathers in the upbringing of children and stir their consciousness and sense of essentialness to their children and to each other, I was invited to a meeting of the Soviet Women's Committee. I was told that there would be a discussion of my articles by experts and members of the press. For a publicist who writes on human relations topics such attention was rare and flattering. But what did I hear? I was told that my position was at odds with the Marxist-Leninist concept of the family, that I was an opponent of women's liberation, that I wanted to tie currently liberated women to swaddling clothes and pots and pans. Some serious labels were applied to me.

I listened to those accusations and was dumbfounded. I got the impression that by appealing to women to love their family and to bear and raise children I was undermining "the social underpinnings." And this was being said by respect doctors and candidates of sciences who had been given awards and medal... and all of them women! At a meeting of the most female of all organizations! So sincere and ardent was their disapproval that I decided that I must be among sexless functionaries, beings of officialdom. There was no sense in talking with them about emotions, about life and nature. So I replied in the language of quotations, figures, official decisions and resolutions. (Fortunately we have all been schooled in that.)

I reminded them that F. Engels felt that labor and the family comprised the essence of human history. If those dogmatists would ponder his formulation of that idea, they would realize that the primary emphasis in it is placed on "the production of human beings." That is

why in his correspondence with early feminists he stressed that the health of the nation was for him more important than formal emancipation. And in "The Situation of the Working Class In England" he warned: if a working woman does not have time for the care and upbringing of her child, that child will never grow up to be a good family member. Just time! Not to mention will, skills and material opportunities. He felt that it was essential that jobs and professions which were heavy or harmful to the physical and moral health of women be banned. And what has the esteemed Committee done to preserve the health of women and our next generation? No amount of regalia or stars will yield complete human happiness if production achievements are attained at the cost of infertility (at that point I cited gloomy statistics on gynecological illnesses among women working in what are by no means the most hazardous branches of production), or at the cost of children becoming virtual orphans.

Naturally I also mentioned V. I. Lenin's debates with advocates of "free love" and a non-family lifestyle, as well as what he said concerning a "philistine couple" who refused to have children due to their own vanity.

Thankfully they heard me out and did not take any "administrative measures."

Most often such debates are useless, because both sides are operating with the information (very meager and often imprecise) which is available to them. The science of the family has been infected with "creeping empiricism" like a stray dog with ring worm. The editors of *Nedelya* have dealt with this topic in greater depth than other press organs and in a more systematic fashion (thanks to personal interest on the part of V. Arkhangel'skiy, then editor-in-chief), and they drew up a series of suggestions concerning the establishment in our country of a Family Service and a corresponding scientific institute, which suggestions were subsequently submitted to the appropriate officials. But obviously nothing was done after that. And now a Children's Institute will be established which will be subordinate to two organizations: the Children's Fund and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences which, incidentally, already has its own institutes — for preschool upbringing, general childrearing problems, nature and methods of instruction, general pedagogics, work with problem children, vocational orientation, etc. And all these institutes deal with children. Their successes are common knowledge. This author feels confident in predicting that a new institute will be unlikely to fill a gap in scientific knowledge about the family, and will in fact be making its own task more difficult: one cannot study childhood apart from parental background, that would be like Salieri, playing music like a corpse.

In my opinion, all these problems should be studied comprehensively and systematically, through the combined efforts of philosophers, sociologists, psychologists,

physiologists and pediatricians, sex therapists, demographers, educators and jurists. A scientific establishment of such a broad and complex nature should, it seems, most appropriately be placed under the aegis of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Unfortunately, until recently that organization demonstrated persistent indifference toward humanitarian problems. How many times the press has called upon the Academy to establish an Institute of Man or a Family Institute, with no response! The coryphaei of science have not even condescended to explain their refusal. Nonetheless the Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences and the Soviet Women's Committee are all officially listed among the founders of the new fund. What is that: belated realization or merely a formalistic action? A "marriage" of generals? I would like to hope for the best. Because in the hands of the aforementioned organizations and all the other institutions and organizations involved with the fund lies not only the fate of orphans, but of 72 million families as well. And each one of the future "patrons" and "patronesses" has so many mistakes to its score and so many debts to pay, that involuntarily I am alarmed by the thought that perhaps we are making new mistakes while rectifying past ones. There are examples to support this, recent examples.

Several years ago some scientists and shortsighted writers started a campaign in defense of the incomplete family, depicting it as a means of increasing the birth rate in our country (since complete families had sharply curtailed the number of children they were having), and as a means for unmarried women and their offspring to achieve happiness. A governmental decision was passed concerning benefits for and assistance to single mothers. This did in fact lead to a sharp increase in the number of incomplete families (more than 500,000 unmarried women have children each year). However, within a short time it became evident that the measure was fraught with serious consequences for the mothers, the children and society. And also for the fathers. It is a well-known fact that they are still indispensable. Mothers began to refuse to register their marriages to the father of their child in order to obtain single-mother benefits: a cash subsidy, preferential status on waiting lists for housing and access to kindergartens and nurseries. Unregistered relationships are always more fragile than those which have been publicly formalized. It also turned out that the "illegal" father had a highly unstable position within the family. The unhealthy situation for children in incomplete families (with non-resident fathers) led to children of such families comprising the largest segment of children in children's homes, boarding schools and special schools for juvenile offenders. Children from such families are sick more often than children from complete families, and more often die or become chronic invalids. And in their subsequent lives they more often have difficulties in family life: they have experience, but of the negative sort.

That is why we need to stop and think not just seven times, but one hundred times seven times before we make a decision affecting children and the family.

It is also quite possible that some parents who are not very fond of children may, when they find out about the people's generosity, be prepared to turn their children over to the state on "humanitarian" grounds, alleging that in a children's home conditions will be better than in the parents' home. That means that we must make provisions which will ensure that giving up a child to be raised at public expense is not "advantageous" to the father and mother.

In an interview published in *Sobesednik* A. Likhanov explained that the fund is not merely an accumulation of money; it is first and foremost a defender of the interests of children before organs and authorities against anyone who would infringe upon those interests, whether that be irresponsible parents, harmful educators, insensitive physicians or bureaucrats from social services agencies. In short, a sort of people's control organization. If a public organization does succeed in prevailing over state institutions, then that will of course be a significant step on the road to democratization of our society. Yet is it possible to achieve that when the organization's founders are not, as we have already noted, well-meaning public figures, renowned defenders of children or wise mothers of large families, but rather the very same official organs which the fund intends to monitor? I can tell that this issue has already come up, because the chairman of the organizational committee has made the forestalling statement that there will be no room in the new organization for "armchair generals," that everyone will have to roll up their sleeves and set to work. Are we to believe that government agencies and organizations will work through a public organization to correct the mistakes which they themselves have made? But if they are going to do everything well and correctly at their own workplaces, why is there any need for yet another supervisory authority?

Believe me, this is not malicious sniping. Merely sincere concern for the fate of a good undertaking. It has become public knowledge that the future fund is seeking a building with several thousand square meters of office space in downtown Moscow. One can feel the latest government agency taking shape! Because if such a huge space is provided, then that will require a substantial staff, offices, reception areas and secretaries. I recalled the story of the establishment of another fund, at first American, then worldwide: "Children As the Peacemakers." It is not backed up by any government decisions, it has no fashionable offices or full-time staff which would absorb a substantial portion of its contributions, yet it is gaining strength and authority. Or the charitable mission headed by Mother Theresa, who has been awarded a Nobel Prize and a "Fighter for Peace" Medal for her selfless work: who "assigned" her to that holy duty?

A. Likhanov's short story "*Good Intentions*" and the movie of the same name contained this correct warning: we cannot let just anyone get close to children who have wounded spirits. In the *Sobesednik* interview mentioned above he applauded the decision of a married couple who had never been either natural or adoptive parents to work in a boarding school. I am disturbed by the breadth of the intrusion by "the public" into this area, one which requires special sensitivity and pedagogical and psychological training. Recall how Makarenko's "ladies' socialist education" suffered from similar control. There is a danger of an unbridled "*Vanity Fair*" among those who are prepared (as A. Likhanov put it) "to realize themselves through others' children" without having first realized themselves in the affairs of their own family.

It saddens me somehow: an organization without precedent in our country, yet it is being established on the old model.

Currently various agencies are preparing to distribute invitations to an upcoming conference: there are too few of them, and they are eagerly sought after. Of course, administrators can get them. It is odd to see A. Katolnikov, director of Syktyvkar Boarding School #1, sitting next to the "benefactors" from the USSR Ministry of Education and Novosti Press Agency who stuck a spoke into his wheels. Incidentally, he is also an eyesore to those of his colleagues who are the first to stick out their hands and ask for assistance. Because at his boarding school Makarenko's system is alive and well; for that reason he not only requires no subsidies, but is even prepared to assist his former students himself. Will these colleagues reach a mutual understanding regarding the goals and means of the fund? In one of the first published responses to the establishment of the fund I read this: public money is essential, for example, for a good children's home which cannot afford to buy decorative lamp shades or benches for a puppet theater. One must apply a very twisted notion of the upbringing of children to arrive at the conclusion that "good" children's homes are the ones where the children may not make or earn money for basic objects for their own use!

Question, questions, questions... Thus far there are more questions than answers. But my suggestions have now taken definite shape.

1. Postpone the founding conference for several months. (The All-Union Teachers' Congress was postponed due to its lack of scientific and practical preparedness to deal with the issue of radical restructuring of education.)

2. Conduct nationwide discussion of the goals and means of the new fund and of the nature and scale of its operations.

3. Let the children, pupils and residents of children's homes decide for themselves which adults may represent their interests at all levels. It does not matter whether the people they select are famous or unknown, they need

only be the people for whom they feel strong affection, their favorite teachers, social workers, writers, performers, artists, children's commissars of neighborhood teams, heads of various circles, stations, clubs and studios, housewives, mothers and grandmothers. Only if that is done can we say that the children have a fund just for them. The selection process can be carried out directly and in stages, but it must be absolutely honest, without pressure.

4. The organization, like any healthy family, should be headed by two equal co-chairpersons: a man and a woman. The woman's seat should be filled by the mother of a family who has wisely and skillfully fulfilled her mission and won public acclaim by doing so. (In my opinion, the best candidate is L. Nikitina, who raised seven wonderful human beings and citizens, creating a model for a physically and morally healthy modern family. Thousands of families in our country and abroad are arranging their lives according to her example and her books.)

5. A most sensitive suggestion. It is difficult to say it. But I cannot remain silent. Give the fund a different name. The name of the great Mother who gave the world a constellation of fighters for the people's happiness: Mariya Aleksandrovna Ulyanova. I am sure that Vladimir Ilich would have approved.

### Afterword

In articles appearing over the past few days there has ever louder and more serious criticism of the mistakes of the past. The farther removed the event, the sharper and more convincing the condemnation. At the same time we are hearing admissions as to the "clarity of hindsight." Perhaps along with the discussion and condemnation of what was done by others it is time to take a clear look at what we and those around us are doing. Yu. Chernichenko has aptly, though caustically, called the current period "glasnost in soft slippers." Until it takes off its comfortable shoes and loses its tendency toward a retrospective style it will be unable to have an opinion and express that opinion about... the decisions which have just been made.

### Editor's note:

And we would like to believe that our readers will correctly understand the position taken by this author, who has been crusading for aid to families and children for many years. Thus her request was a natural one: to contribute her honorarium for this article to Account #707.)

Copyright: "Izdatelstvo "Pravda", "Ogonek", 1987.

**Aspects of Prostitution in Georgia Examined**  
*18130002 Tbilisi AKHALGAZRDA KOMUNISTI in Georgia 16 Jun 87 p 4*

[Article by Manana Kartoza and Tamaz Cheishvili: "Today's 'Amazons'"—First two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] In this article the two reporters talk about immorality. Two positions are set in opposition to each other—the categorical and the tolerant. For this reason, all the material is set in boldface and lightface, dialog-style. Readers will have no trouble determining our final position; after all, what alternative is there when we are discussing people who sell their bodies?

Not long ago something terrible took place in our republic. A school and village were confronted with the totally unexpected case of a 13-year-old girl giving birth to a child. After the alarm was sounded, it turned out that the girl had been leading an immoral life since the age of 11. With whom and in what circumstances was difficult to determine, she lived in such a wretched family. The case itself was abnormal enough, but the whole thing was so unsettling that a newspaper article was written about it. Our message to the Education Ministry, to society, was "What Shall We Do With the Children!?" But the article was not printed, copies were merely sent to the appropriate organs, and we were not able to reveal it to you, dear readers. But now we must think together about such "embarrassing" matters and speak up, because pussy-footing has given rise to the idea that society has grown more indulgent toward such immoral phenomena. [end of editorial introduction]

It was not hard to find the heroine of this article in Tbilisi. She and her friend live in a one-room, 100-ruble-a-month apartment. There are untold numbers of such single women in our midst, and most of them are Georgians—let's not console ourselves thinking they came from somewhere else. In outward appearance they are not much different from ordinary women, though often they are more attractive, for they do not have to wash and iron mountains of clothes, prepare meals for the family, spend sleepless nights at a child's bedside and be concerned with upbringing. In short, they are interested only in themselves. And their success depends crucially on their attractiveness.

Women of easy virtue are not born that way, even as no one is born a thief, a drunk, or a dope addict; that happens later.

Why? What for? There are various causes, but the result is the same.

We will recount our heroines' stories with documentary accuracy, though we will not reveal their real names.

**Meet Greta!**

This Greta is a strange one. I called before I went to her place (one would hardly dare to do anything against her wishes). She answered in a sleepy voice, "Come on up." I went.

At this point I should describe her apartment—I can still see the little room on the third floor. The walls are decorated with Russian, Georgian, Latin, and English inscriptions along with colored drawings. It seems educated people often visit the place and leave these linguistic creations behind them. There is a couch against one wall, where her roommate Jane sleeps. She herself sleeps on the floor, on a grey rug. On a table next to the wall are many little boxes of gouache, paintbrushes, and drawings. There is nothing else in the room. Above the door we read, in English, "Welcome!" To the right of that we see "The gods are to be found in the silence, not in uprisings and storms..." and, just beyond that, in English, "But God is dead."

"What does that mean?" I ask Greta.

"It means maybe there was a God once, but he is no longer, he's dead."

"Why?"

"Otherwise he would not look upon all this injustice so uncaringly."

Further along the wall we read, in Latin, "What is permitted does not always merit respect."

The girl and her apartment are of purely professional interest to me; I am trying to fathom her psychology. She has grown so accustomed to me that I can ask anything and she will answer. She is also used to the fact that I am writing everything down. She's even amused by it.

"Last night I dreamed I was in jail and some guy was saying, 'I want you to be my lover.'"

"Maybe you should get a job."

"Jane told me I'll wind up in jail... Can you imagine!"

Then she thought of something about Jane. Her mother has been warning her not to just take a lover but to set her sights on a husband.

"Why is that?" I asked.

"It seems people had been talking at work, so Jane's mother says, 'Now if you take a lover...'"

"Not so fast," I interrupted Greta, "I can't get it all down!"

"Look, this isn't a lesson in dictation. Next time, bring a tape recorder—no, wait, that would make it a legal document, and I wouldn't like that. OK, I'll go slow, but just don't interrupt. I don't like being interrupted."

"Go on."

"Well, Jane's mother keeps telling her if she has to take a lover, it should be strictly for consumerist reasons, otherwise it's stupid. 'If you don't intend to get married you should at least take up with a lover who can repair things.... I have some things in my kitchen that need repairing.'"

"Who, you?" I ask Greta, interrupting again.

"Not me, Jane's mother!" The veins are standing out on Greta's neck.

"In that case, Jane's mother ought to take on a whole repair crew [dompleksnaya brigada] as lover," I said.

"Who'd want her? She's old!"

\* \* \*

Two under-age girls have been placed in a closed-type venereal disease clinic in Tbilisi. They are N.T., age 16, who lives in Gldani Rayon, and her sister E.T., age 15. Their mother is raising the older girl's two children. The two patients names as the source of their infection two university students named "Gela" and "Avto."

In many cases it is impossible to find or determine the identity of such persons, because they do not need much time to get acquainted, and the names are mostly made up. The only details these sexual tramps can recall are, e.g., "moustached, tall, good-looking, drives a light-colored Zhiguli, dressed in jeans...."

Every year, more than 600 requests come in from various venereal disease institutions of the USSR, asking us to trace men (never women) who have had relations with persons infected with venereal disease.

\* \* \*

I read the writings on the wall again. To the left, in Russian: "Don't drink, for in a state of intoxication you might embrace your class enemy."

"Very good, very topical," I say with a straight face.

Greta brightened up: "Once I was going with a well known athlete—quite a while, maybe 9 months. Well, a friend of his wife's saw us together a few times... So she went to my family's home one time when I wasn't there. Good thing my father wasn't there, he'd have killed me. But my mother and grandmother were (grandma was still alive at the time).

"So I go home and my mother asks, 'Where have you been?'"

"I answer, 'I was with my daughter' (she lives with my husband's parents).

"So she says, 'You're lying, you've been going with So-and-so!'"

"My grandma says, 'Greta, you're a whore! When your father gets back from his trip I'm telling him everything,' and she starts to cry.

"So I say, 'And I'll tell grandpa about the affair you had with the kerosene man in 1943!'"

"Grandma's eyes went wide with fear, and she goes, 'Those were different times, life was tough, your grandfather was at the front, the kids needed help!'"

"So I say, 'Did you tell Grandpa?'"

"She says, 'Tell what?'"

"I say, 'About the kerosene man.'"

"She says, 'It wasn't as if he didn't know....'"

Silence.

\* \* \*

The Georgian CP Central Committee and the Georgian MVD conducted raids in various cafes and bars, hotels, movie heaters, and cultural palaces in Tbilisi, Batumi, and Poti. They caught 49 immoral women engaged in prostitution. A total of 28 of them had come to Georgia, on the basis of personal contacts, to make money. Especially alarming is that fact that quite a few minors were among those suspected of immoral acts. They were staying in the hotels in violation of passport and hotel regulations. N.A. and E.M., both under-aged girls, were living unregistered in Batumi's Medea Hotel. Thanks to the hotel administration's laxity they were having a fine time in the company of four under-aged boys.

Also alarming is the fact that some men, to make money, stoop so low as to "take shares in the prostitution industry." Participants in the raid apprehended Tbilisians I.D. And M. Sh. in the act of taking "clients" to their lodgers, for which they expected to be paid.

\* \* \*

We heard noises through the wall.

"Who lives there," I asked.



"A married woman. The other day she told me, 'How long are you going to go on like this? You should take a rich lover, you'd be better off and your neighbors would respect you more...' But I can't do that. If I don't like a guy I won't go to bed with him."

"How many men have you had?"

"You could be the 58th...."

Greta stood up, went to the table, and handed me a notebook with a blue cover: "Here it's all written down."

"What is?"

"Everybody's name, height, weight, and abilities."

"And you say you've made love with 57 men? Were they all worthy?"

"Maybe not, but if the guy at the moment smiles and treats me nice, that's all I want, I make no other demands. In other words, I do what I want. I take a man when I want to and not when he wants to. I go to bed when I please and not when someone else wants me to. That kind of thing gives me spiritual comfort [dukhovnyy komfort], and that's more important than going to bed with someone for money. Otherwise I'd lose that spiritual comfort, I'd be a different person. I don't want that, I don't like it. That neighbor of mine tells me I shouldn't just give it away yet she's a wife and mother, an honest woman, while I'm just a whore."

\* \* \*

The efforts of public and vocational school teachers in the matter of sex education are still unsatisfactory. Last year, 20 cases of students with gonorrhea and syphilis were recorded. In Borzhomi Rayon, a 7th-grader in an 8-year school was having sex regularly with other students. There have been cases in which students expelled from schools have come under the influence of the streets. For example, an 8th-grader in Rustavi Secondary School no 9 ran away from home and lived in Tbilisi. at 29 Moliti Street, with other women of questionable character. She had had relations with a lot of men but could name only 10 of them.

An 8th-grade girl in Samtavisi, Kaspi Rayon, dropped out of school and came to Tbilisi. She listed 33 sexual contacts in her notebook.

\* \* \*

"You probably have a lot of free time, you don't work...."

"I spend all my free time on men."

"Why?"

"Hey, what am I supposed to do? Smoke anasha or shoot dope?"

"What do you live on?"

"I take jobs and I paint at home."

"Do you always have a job?"

"Oh, no."

"When you don't, what do you eat?"

"Oh, different things. Sometimes my 'guests' bring something, sometimes Jane's do."

"But you said your lovers 'get it' for nothing."

"Well, they do. They usually gobble up the food they bring."

"What really interests you most?"

"After men, painting. If it wasn't for art, I would devote my whole life just to love—like the Greeks did. A good man is like a god."

"What kind of man is your ideal?"

"Strength and wings...."

"You mean a pilot?"

"A man whom I feel confident with and not afraid of anything at his side."

"How long can you stand to be with the same man?"

"Not indefinitely, certainly. He has to be good-looking, sure of himself."

"Why did you leave home?"

"To find freedom."

### Those Who Have Found Freedom

In October of last year Citizen I. of Kiev set herself up in the Amirani Hotel. Nine days later she got a job as a child care worker 2nd class in Tskhneti's Kindergarten No 5. She has named seven men with whom she had relations, and is now confined to a VD clinic.

Women of doubtful reputation are often to be found in the city's public food service establishments. For example, Citizen M.O. came from Makhachkala to Tbilisi, was living unregistered at 25 Otskheli Street, and "found a cozy place" in the Maiko Cafe. She had relations, for material consideration, with all kinds of men.

\* \* \*

"Who would deprive you of your freedom at home?"

"My parents have a different idea of freedom, they're stereotypes."

"Why did you quite your husband?"

"The same reason."

"With so many men, aren't you afraid one of them will give you gift of AIDS?"

"There's a risk to everything. If you go fishing, you'll get your feet wet. Need I say more?"

\* \* \*

Public pressure is weak with regard to the timely detection and halting of perverted sex. Not enough attention is paid to detecting and registering homosexuals. For years, G. of Borzhomi was having perverted sexual relations with school students, a fact which escaped the attention of their parents, neighbors, and teachers. Last year, three homosexuals of various ages were found out in Borzhomi. One of them had infected a minor with VD, for which he was sentenced to 6 years.

\* \* \*

"What do you think of women?"

"I'm fascinated by pretty women. If you want the truth, I look down on them; it's hard to find a worthy rival."

"How old are you?"

"Twenty-seven."

"How do you imagine yourself at 47?"

"I'm afraid of aging—not because it's boring but because I've become accustomed to success with men. When I'm 47, the chances of success will go down by at least 60 percent and I'll be bankrupt as a person."

"Would you be willing to have 10 husbands?"

"Only on condition that each one had his own place and each one pampered me and loved me, was insanely jealous and suffered for it...."

"What does the term 'mother' mean to you?"

\* \* \*

In the republic Dermatology and VD Clinical Dispensary today lies a mother who was removed from the maternity hospital when it was found that her child was born with syphilis. Her daughter, a 7th-grader, was also found to have syphilis, contracted from her stepfather.

\* \* \*

"Mother?" That's tough to define, although in principle I love children. I have a daughter, but I look on her as a sister, a lovely creation.... In my opinion, a child is a source of additional pleasure, although you shouldn't idolize him. Sometimes I get the powerful urge to pray, but it doesn't last long."

"Do you believe in God?"

"I believe in Fate."

"What do you think about money?"

"I love it, being able to give people gifts. After all, 'we' are a kind people."

"What about dope addicts?"

"I have no complaints against them. Everyone kills himself as he pleases.... But anyone who gets bloated with easy living and turns to dope is an idiot...."

Greta paused for a moment, nervously straightened the hair over her forehead, look at her watch, and said:

"You have to go now, I've got someone coming. You've wasted your time writing this down, no one's going to print it."

\* \* \*

Greta was not really worried. She counted on the notion that open discussion of this topic is unacceptable, and the Criminal Code does not call for punishment of prostitution—hence, she is not considered guilty of a crime. There is only the force of tradition, which comes down to us from ancient times and for a long time was stronger than any legislation. That force was something called the honor of men and the cult of womanhood, but today some other lever is needed to preserve that tradition. Women have become all too accessible: If you wish, you could be the 58th or the 158th "lover"—and all for free.

As to what that lever should be is something we all need to think about, dear reader. We need to think about it before AIDS becomes a devastating epidemic among us too.

6854/12232

**LiSSR Sociologists Question Students on Politics, Religion**

*18000008a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
23 Sep 87p 3*

[Interview with Professor Valentinas Lazutka, director of the Philosophy, Sociology, and Law Institute at the Lithuanian SSR Academy of Sciences, doctor of philosophical sciences, by ELTA correspondent Rita Grumadaite: "Honestly— About Ourselves and Others"]

[Text] How do you assess the Soviet political system, relations between nationalities in the republic, and what are your views on religion? Studies on these topics have been conducted in universities, high schools, and technical schools in Vilnius by scientists of the Philosophy, Sociology, and Law Institute at the LiSSR Academy of Sciences. Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish youth 16 to 24 years of age answered the poll's questions. ELTA correspondent Rita Grumadaite asked Valentinas Lazutka, doctor of philosophical sciences, professor, director of the Institute, to comment on the results of these studies.

[Lazutka] In bilingual republics, knowledge of languages in many aspects determines mutual respect in relations among people of different nationalities. Among the Soviet republics, Lithuania has the largest number of Russian residents who know the local language and more than half of the Lithuanians know Russian. Our poll attests to the fact that an absolute majority of young people think well of mutual relations and mutual respect among working people of different nationalities in the republic. The analysis of the poll results did not show any tensions in these relations either now or in the future. There is no doubt about the honesty of the answers provided by the students: the poll was anonymous.

[Question] Is cosmopolitanism typical for a large part of the youth? Ideologists from capitalistic countries claim that Soviet youth admires the Western culture and way of life.

[Lazutka] The poll refuted even our own forecasts: only 1 percent of those polled had chosen the answer that the Motherland is where the life is good. Students assess the place of a person in bourgeois society quite realistically, express a concern over the aggressive politics of NATO, and see a serious danger in it.

The results of these studies must disappoint the masters of hostile foreign radio stations broadcasting programs to the USSR. It was found out that the most popular radio channels are those which do not have special programs in the Russian, Lithuanian, or Polish languages, and broadcast mainly new musical records. Distrust of news broadcasts was also expressed. Even those who regularly listen to the foreign broadcasts maintain that they contain many lies and skillful fabrications. Assessing such information on principle, and realistically, the young people of Vilnius did not support the religious and

nationalistic mob assembled on August 23 in Vilnius near the church of St. Anna, which was so fervently propagandized by foreign radio stations, appealing to the national feelings of Lithuanians.

[Question] Is it possible that the young people are not interested in politics and history at all? Lately, the only thing we hear about is the kinds of musical trends and directions coming in and out of fashion...

[Lazutka] Obviously, one thing does not interfere with another. According to the sociological poll results, one cannot blame the youth for being apolitical, the students deeply support the restructuring taking place in the country. They are interested in the new laws and other regulations being published in the press. The vast majority of both the Lithuanian and Russian youth would like, while attending high school or a university, to obtain more knowledge concerning the history of Lithuania, and to understand better certain questions of the history of the USSR. By the way, the fact that the students of technical schools remember better than other students all kinds of important historical dates was quite unexpected. To create competent school books is the foremost task of historians. The time has come to introduce a separate course of the history of the Lithuanian SSR in the secondary schools. I think that our ideological adversaries will in the future continue to try to use certain political moments which have been either incompletely or not openly enough discussed. As a rule, young people are the target of such disinformation. Therefore, it is necessary to erase the "white spots" of history, to publish documents, explain complicated problems, and reveal the complicated dialectics of history.

[Question] What is the ideological world view of modern youth? How do the young people assess the political system of Soviet society and its individual institutions?

[Lazutka] Unfortunately, the secondary school still does not prepare the active propagandists of advanced thought. Only a relatively small part of the young people consider themselves atheists, that is, actively participate in anti-religious activities, although a vast majority, 90 percent of students, regardless of nationality indicated in the poll that they do not tie their lives to either religion or the church. Still, 1 percent of those polled consider themselves deeply religious. This is evidence of serious problems in ideological education.

The young people think that they participate inadequately in government. This is most likely related to age: more than half of the girls and boys who were polled had never before participated in elections. The absolute majority of young people admit the democratic nature of the Soviet political system and understand it as the power of the people manifested through the elected bodies.

Presently, it is especially necessary to teach democracy to the young people and to reveal its necessity under the conditions of socialism. We also must substantially improve political and atheistic education. We should teach young people, while still on the school bench, to discuss and think, rather than to blindly follow or reject unacceptable notions. The young people must become reliable helpers in the process of wide democratization that has begun in the county.

13355

**Lithuanian Language Classes to be Broadcast on TV**

18000008b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian  
7 Oct 87p 3

[Article by A. Masaytis, broadcast editor: "Lessons From the TV Screen"]

[Text] Starting from October 11, 1987, Lithuanian television will begin a new program called "Learning Lithuanian Language." It will be on the air every second week on Sundays at 11:05 and repeated on Tuesdays at 10:00.

What is this program about and for whom is it intended?

The name itself indicates that the Lithuanian language will be taught during the program. It is intended for those inhabitants of our republic for whom Lithuanian is not their mother tongue and who would like to learn it. The program is introduced with an assessment of the actual language situation in the republic and the importance of the national language in the economy, education, cultural life, everyday life, and other activities, as well as of individual wishes.

The Lithuanian language as a subject is taught in the republic in Russian and Polish general schools, special schools, professional-technical schools, and in higher schools in academic groups. However, the level of education, with the exception of maybe the higher schools, is still quite low. Graduating from various types of secondary schools, the young people have a poor command of Lithuanian, and later many of them "pick up" the language on their own; most often through contacts with their peers and neighbors who speak Lithuanian. The matter is also complicated by the fact that there are no school books nor other educational means designed for independent studies. In recent times at a number of multi-national work collectives, Lithuanian language courses have begun. Language courses organized through an initiative of various organizations, ispolkoms, and particular enterprises and institutions are also popular. For example, such courses are given at the Vilnius Znaniye Society, at the Shyaulyay "Nuklon" Production Association, at the Shyaulyay Pedagogical Institute, in Jonava, Klaypeda, etc.

All this is evidence of a growing need to study the national language. In turn, this need is the result of the friendship of the Soviet peoples and of Lenin's nationality policy. It quite obviously demonstrates the fact that people of different nationalities living in the republic get on well together and respect each other.

Of all the Soviet republics, Lithuania has the largest percent of Russian inhabitants who have learned the local language. A majority of the Poles living in Lithuania know Lithuanian, and over half of the Lithuanians know Russian, and many of them also speak Polish. And, without any doubt, this process will spread and develop.

Given such a situation, television cannot stand aside. Its services here may be quite helpful. A special TV program may effectively resolve a part of the existing problems and carry out substantial work: it could help those people who study Lithuanian on their own to learn it, and it will promote advanced methods of study and accelerate the learning process.

A two-year study program has been created for the televised "Learning the Lithuanian Language." In order to expedite practical language teaching, only those subjects that will help to develop spoken language skills, have been selected from the phonetics and grammar curriculum. Also, only those words have been selected from the rich lexicon of the Lithuanian language that are necessary for practical usage.

The main objective of this program is to build a strong language basis rather than to present a broad and fundamental course of the Lithuanian language. At the end of the academic year (in June) a meeting with the viewers is scheduled, where we will be able to hear their opinions, proposals, and wishes, and they will have the opportunity to share their thoughts of how to improve the program. Thus, on Sunday, we invite all of those who want to study Lithuanian to the television screens.

13355

**Birth Control Advocated in Tajikistan**

18340411 Dushanbe TOJIKISTON SOVETI in Tajik  
29 Jul 87 p 3

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe TOJIKISTON SOVETI in Tajik on 29 July 1987 carries on page 3 five letters to the editor under the headline "We Consider Reasonable" and the subtitle "Good fortune and Misfortune of Having Many Children (TOJIKISTON SOVETI 15 July)." An introduction titled "Numbers for Consideration" states that according to Tajikistan's Ministry of Social Security there were 178,299 mothers of many children in the republic as of 1 January 1987; 36,505 of these are heroine mothers; of the heroine mothers, more than 7,000 has 11 or more children. During a single year the state provides more than 27 million rubles of support a money to mothers of many children.

A 300-word letter, "The Essence of the Dispute" by A. Rahmonov, a student at Tajikistan State University, opens by quoting the Soviet economist B.Ts. Uralnis to the effect that having many children is admirable in the abstract but should be opposed for its effect on women's health and because it prevents women from achieving equality with men. Rahmonov adds that unregulated births are harmful not only to the mother's health but also to the correct upbringing of children in matters including work and learning. Although a child's upbringing is every parent's responsibility, some do not take it seriously enough and leave it entirely to preschools and schools. The result is children characterized by bad morals, absenteeism from work, drunkenness, and theft. There are large families in which only one or two people work; the family income is low and cannot meet the family's needs. A bad material base also affects children's upbringing. There are families with one or two children in which the children are spoiled. Under these circumstances some children become self-centered. Many large families live in the countryside, where kindergartens, sports facilities, children's libraries, clubs, and modern medical facilities are often lacking. This too affects a child's upbringing. In Tajikistan, especially in the rural areas, medical services are inadequate; there are unregulated births, illnesses, and many deaths. People need to be informed about medical realities. That is why Tahmonov thinks that the article about large families brought out the essence of the dispute. The article rightly stated that there are many marriages between close relatives in Tajikistan and that this leads to children with genetic disorders and few healthy offspring. Rahmonov thinks the authorities should prevent such marriages.

A 200-word letter, "One Should Not Be Impartial" by S. Mastonozod, an inhabitant of Dushanbe, states that a high birth rate is a problem which must be solved not only in Tajikistan but in most of the third world. Tajikistan's current rate of growth to the year 2000 is appropriate and ought not be altered artificially. However there are worrisome issues for "our people": bad health care and child rearing. The quality of children's health care is often forgotten; the young generation is weak. Mastonozod particularly agrees with the point made in the article on large families that having a child every year is bad for health of both mother and child. Although this problem has been solved to a degree in the cities, it remains unsolved in the countryside. Many women do not want to bear a child every year but do so because they have no means of birth control.

A 100-word letter, "Quality Not Quantity Is necessary" by Mastura Ghulomova, a teacher in Ordzhonikidzeabad city, states that most of the poor students in her classes come from large families. She considers this a natural consequence of the fact that their parents lack the means and the strength to give the children a well-rounded upbringing. These parents have little involvement in their children's education. If one of their

children is doing poorly in school or is a truant, such parents will say that they have 10 children and therefore have no time to keep an eye on all of them.

A 400-word letter, "Let Us Consider the Possible" by Bibiquand Dodokhonova, a middle school teacher in Dushanbe, states that having many children is harmful to society as a whole as well as mothers and children. Nowadays many of "our women" do not participate in social production because of their numerous children. They do not have the time to raise their intellectual level. Routine chores and numerous children prevent some women from ever leaving their village, city, or oblast. Someone who is ignorant cannot raise children fit for the times. Many large families cannot provide for their children's economic and intellectual needs. Some people with large families use that fact as a rationale for pilfering social property. That is a negative influence on children. Dodokhonova expresses concern over the upbringing of some of her students who come from large families. She cites the example of parents of a problem child who contend that because of their many children they cannot be involved in each child's upbringing, which should be left to the schools. Dodokhonova states that many of "our people" hold this view. Although the urban and rural population is rising in Tajikistan housing construction, bringing idle land into use, and other factors do not keep pace. Dodokhonova opposes having more than 3-4 children, given the shortage of space.

A 400-word letter, "Let Us Not Allow Child Mortality" by Saodat Muhammadiyeva, a pediatrician and candidate in medicine, states that the article on large families and poses the issue correctly in both a social and medical sense. Muhammadiyeva is worried about anemia among young mothers. Scientific research shows that 33 percent of the pregnant women in Dushanbe and 40-63 percent of them in the surrounding rayons are anemic. One of the causes is having children in close succession. Twenty percent of the women having their first child are anemic but after having four children 40 percent of the women are anemic. After each birth the disease becomes more acute. Women who become anemic, who do not take the disease seriously and continue to have children, become emaciated and can become seriously ill. Such women usually have premature children, who are underdeveloped and underweight. These children will have subsequent medical problems; they are prone to a wide variety of illnesses and have a higher mortality rate than children born to healthy mothers. Another cause of anemia is an improper diet. Most women who are pregnant or who have recently given birth ignore a proper diet. They consume primarily carbohydrates and do not get enough protein, vitamins, or minerals. The quantity and quality of a mother's milk is linked to her diet. There is a popular misconception that after each birth a woman's body is renewed. If a woman allows an interval of 3-4 years between births she will suffer no ill effects but unregulated births led to various illnesses, not only anemia but also hepatitis, heart and circulator disease, gastro-intestinal disease, and other maladies.

/9738

**Problems Training Skilled Workers in Tajikistan**  
*18340410 Dushanbe KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, Jul 87 pp 69-76*

[Article by Sh. Sultonov]

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, July 1987 carries on pages 69-76, under the rubric "Higher Schools: Reforms' Steps," a 2500-word article, "The Insistent Demand of the times" by Sh. Sultonov, Tajikistan's minister of higher and specialized middle education. Sultonov states that there are many unsolved problems in planning specialist training. The principle cause of this is the dispersed administration of institutions of higher education. Tajikistan has 10 institutions of higher education and 40 specialized middle schools; they are now subject to 10 Union- and republic-level ministries and administrative bodies.

Tajikistan now has more than 32,000 agricultural specialists, which is sufficient for the republic's needs. During the 11th 5-Year Plan fewer students were accepted for training in agricultural specialties and training in some fields was halted altogether. About 40 percent of the agricultural specialists work in jobs unrelated to agriculture. At the same time, 33.8 percent of the 25,500 agricultural leaders and specialists have no specialized training; the figure rises to 70 percent for leaders of "intermediate links." More than 1,000 people with higher or specialized middle education work at jobs which do not require specialized training.

Some years ago concern was voiced over the textile industry's imminent need for skilled equipment operators. The Leninabad branch of the Tajikistan Polytechnic Institute was established to train the needed workers. This year it had its first 30 graduates—but Gosplan required 40. A similar shortfall is predicted for the coming years. Now the Ministry of Light Industry is raising the question of sending students in the Polytechnic Institute's light industrial equipment program to educational institutions in the central part of the Soviet Union. "This is the result of an old fashioned relation, especially an unsuitable relation, to work."

Ministries and administrative bodies make their wants known but have not been materially, morally, or juridically responsible for training specialists and also have not been involved in developing the material base of institutions of higher education. This is the cause of the discrepancy between the number and types of specialists needed and those actually produced. Several government bodies often reject young specialists (the State Agriculture Committee, the Ministry of Automotive Transportation, the Ministry of Commerce, and the prosecutor's office of the republic).

Tajikistan has a big shortage of engineers. Yet Tajikistan's Polytechnic Institute has produced many engineers. The faculty of industrial and civil construction produces more than 300 engineers annually but no more than 40 percent of them begin work in their specialty.

Recently the press proposed increasing female enrollment in higher and specialized middle schools by declaring some schools or faculties to be women's schools or faculties. The pedagogical schools of Leninabad, Kaniabadam, and Dushanbe are already de facto women's schools because they have almost exclusively female enrollments (99.3 percent, 83.6 percent, and 99.1 percent female, respectively). Female enrollment in other pedagogical schools in the republic is much lower (Pendzhikent, 52.8 percent of the total student body; Kulyab, 49.8 percent; Kurgan-Tyube, 59.4 percent; Garm, 19.4 percent). Female enrollment is under 41 percent of the total at two other technical schools (commerce and food industry). Turning technical schools into women's schools is not by itself the answer to low female enrollments. A single school may also teach some specialties which are more attractive to boys than to girls. It is questionable whether excluding young men from medical schools is useful. It would be wise to have more men in the teaching profession.

Currently only 86 out of 100 graduates work at their assigned job. The main reason is that most assignment forms contain the notation, "without the provision of housing." Sultonov calls on the ministries and administrative bodies for whom these specialists were trained to change their situation.

Most graduates of general education schools, especially in villages, do not know Russian well. This impedes successful study by young Tajikistanis in the Soviet Union's institutions of higher education. The deficiency is also evident when they do their military service. They have great difficulty learning modern military technology. Their knowledge of the Russian language and literature is "bad" because they were improperly taught. The training of Russian language and literature teachers is unsatisfactory. If the faculties of Russian language and literature at Tajikistan State University and the State Pedagogical Institutes of Dushanbe and Leninabad had expert instructors then the people they trained would be competent specialists. The State Pedagogical Institute of Kulyab has had a faculty of Russian language and literature for 25 years. For the most part it does a poor job.

Tajikistan is among the lowest-ranking Soviet republics in the doctoral- and candidate-level training of people in technical and scientific fields. Tajikistan's Ministry of Higher and Specialized Middle Education and the educational institutions subject to it have been negligent in this regard.

Sultonov expresses concern over the low professional level of some teachers and their limited "moral culture." Little is done to instill in students in higher and technical schools a love and pride in their chosen specialty. Many of the students in these schools have a low cultural level. This is associated with the existence among them of "localism, nationalism, devotion to religion, etc." There are short-comings in the way the Ministry of Higher and Specialized Middle Education deals with this.

/9738

#### **Former Policemen Stage Moscow Armed Robbery**

18000090 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian on 18 November 87 carries on page 2 a 1,900 word report by V. Umnov titled "The Case of the Ex-Militiamen," describing an armed holdup that took place outside the Morozhnyy Department Store in Moscow a year ago. According to the report, a group of former militia personnel was responsible for the theft of 333,000 rubles in the holdup, which involved the use of guns and resulted in several deaths. The money was apparently recovered and the culprits apprehended within 15 hours. The recent trial of the two surviving criminals resulted in one being sentenced to death and the other to 10 years' imprisonment.

/06662

#### **Rostov Komsomol Discusses Youth Crime, Gang Fighting**

18000098 [Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Nov 87 carries on page 1 under the headline "Look Truth Square in the Eye" a 1,100-word Rostov-na-Donu report by staff correspondent Yu. Beshpalov on discussions at the Rostov Komsomol Obkom Plenum. Focusing on "negative phenomena among young people," the Komsomol Obkom first secretary noted that 70 percent of the crimes in the oblast are committed by people under the age of 30. Beshpalov goes on to detail a fight involving "several dozen people" that broke out in a Taganrog park after a dance. It was only broken up by a "major detachment of militiamen and firemen using water cannon." Beshpalov attributed the fight to "territorial divisions" among local youths. Beshpalov also recounts how local university students took action against one of their fellows, who openly boasted that a place was waiting for him at the party raykom, and expelled him for "careerism." The report ends on an optimistic note by stating that the newly elected Rostov Komsomol secretary was the most "approachable and sincere" of the candidates running for office.

/06662

#### **Soviet-American Press Conference on Alcoholism Held**

18300012 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian  
17 Sep 87 p 6

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 17 September 1987 carries on page 6 an 800-word report on a press conference of American and Soviet specialists on alcoholism held in Moscow on 15 September. Participants included the senior scientist at the Institute of Psychology of the USSR Academy of Sciences, a representative of the Dartmouth University Medical School, a representative of the National Council on International Problems, the medical director of the Betty Ford Institute, the first deputy chairman of the Central Council of the All-Union Voluntary Society for Sobriety, and a member of Alcoholics Anonymous. The delegations discussed problems of alcoholism common to both countries, as well as different methods of treatment and prevention.

/9738

#### **School Reform Efforts Assailed**

18310415a [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri 18 September 1987 carries on page 1 a 1000-word lead editorial headlined "School Reform is Everyone's Work" on shortcomings emerging in the first 4 years of school reform. "Does not the fact that a significant percentage of schools are located in dark, inadequate, inappropriate buildings, the fact of the terrible state of providing food, the fact that space and work places, modern equipment and tools needed in order to prepare for a definite skill, which students need in order to work in a productive labor sector, master the necessary practical work habits and grow up in a spirit of love of labor are not provided, the fact of the instances of legal violations among adolescents—even those of a criminal nature—and the fact that some secondary school graduates are leading a parasitic life—do not all these embody carelessness and indifference?"

/12232

#### **Lack of Computers in Schools Criticized**

18310415b [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 29 September 1987 carries on page 1 an 800-word lead editorial headlines "The Computer in the School" on progress being made in introducing the new school" on progress being made in introducing the new school subject on the fundamentals of information and computer technology. Noting that "last year 36 computer departments were established in certain schools with Yamaha Agat, DVK-1, DVK-2m, and KUVT-86 computers," it is added that "in order to establish new departments in all schools to correspond to the defined norm, approximately 30,000 computers are needed. But

up to the present only 900 have been acquired." The editorial also points out that certain computers—the KChVT-86, Agat, DVK-1, and DVK-2m—are not functioning properly.

/12232

### **Level of Legal Services To Be Improved**

18130415d [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 2 September 1987 carries on page 1 a 1000-word lead editorial headlined "The Law Is for Everyone" on shortcomings in legal services provided to the population. It points out that "the level of legal services provided to the population still does not correspond to demands stemming from the duty to restructure the social and economic life of the country or to the development of democracy at the modern stage. Last year reviews of approximately 20 percent of the criminal cases and 15 percent of the civil cases in Baku city courts were postponed and review deadlines of some of these cases were violated. Some courts have not refrained from sending cases back for additional investigation, although there has been every reason to rule for acquittal; suffice it to say that last year only one out of every five cases returned for additional investigation was brought to a conclusion."

/12232

### **'Formalism' Among Teachers Assailed**

18310415e [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri on 11 September 1987 carries on page 1 a 1000-word lead editorial headlined "Quality Is a Requirement of Restructuring" on problems persisting

in the educational system is still a seriously disturbing and unsolved problem. Research and observation, results of the last school year and acceptance examinations to higher schools reveal that no basic change has occurred, that instances of formalism still predominate and that program materials are still not mastered. The fact that this question of state importance is in such an unsatisfactory condition is related to the activity of teachers. "They are accused of "being out of step with modern demands and unable to refrain from outmoded ways and indifference."

/12232

### **Improvements in Foreign Language Teaching Proposed**

18130415c [Editorial Report] Baku AZARBAYJAN MUALLIMI in Azeri on 21 August 1987 carries on page 2 a 1000-word article by A. Tahirov, director of the foreign languages department at the Azerbaijan Pedagogical Institute, and O. Bunyadov, secretary of the API faculty party group, headlined "Restructuring and Problems of Teaching Foreign Languages in Higher Schools" noting a number of problems awaiting solutions. They propose that: programs and textbooks be reexamined; councils to supervise the training of cadres be formed; technical equipment and teaching aids be introduced to bring lectures up to date; courses to improve teachers' expertise be organized; seminars and conferences for foreign language teachers be held; teachers be granted long-term assignments for studying foreign languages abroad; and more readers and terminology dictionaries be published.

/12232



### **Restructuring, Acceleration Progress in Belorussia Discussed**

*18000092a Moscow PARTIYNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 20, Oct 87 (signed to press 13 Oct 87) pp 15-21*

[Article by Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian CP Central Committee: "Let's Raise Work Style and Methods to the Level of Present-Day Requirements"]

[Text] The restructuring has entered the phase when substantial acceleration can be given to the development of productive forces and to the improvement of production relations by the radical reform of the administration of the economy, by qualitative changes in the economic mechanism. Basing itself upon a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis of the processes that are occurring in society, the June 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee worked out an integrated system of administration of the national economy, which system has been called upon to exert a revolutionizing effect upon all aspects of the labor and life of Soviet citizens, and to reveal with the greatest completeness the creative potential of socialism. The essence of that system lies in the changeover from administrative to chiefly economic methods of leadership, broad democratization, the complete activation of the human factor, and the reorientation of the national economy from intermediate results to the final ones.

### **Managing Efficiently and Effectively**

Today the Belorussian Republic party organization is doing much to assure the most rapid implementation of the decision of the June Plenum of the Central Committee. The center of gravity of its work has been shifted to the extension of painstaking, purposeful organizing and political-ideological work among the labor collectives and to the taking of all steps to build up the rates of the reforms. The task that has been assigned is to assure that every labor collective, every individual worker, achieves the best practical results in the appropriate field of activity.

The goals and tasks of the work under the new conditions have been discussed and studied in the party organizations, labor collectives, schools of concrete economics, and at economic seminars. All this has given an outlet to initiative from below, and has made it possible to obtain a large number of concrete recommendations.

The party committees and primary organizations, intensifying their influence upon all aspects of the life of the labor collectives, and building up and deepening the reforms that have been begun, are striving to carry out all measures to increase the responsibility borne by Communists and administrators for the state of affairs and for the resolution of the problems that have come to a head. It is precisely in this manner that a restructuring of the activity is occurring at the Mozyr, Pinsk, Soligorsk, Novopolotsk, and Osipovich party gorkoms and the

Berezovskiy, Glubokskiy, Grodnenskiy, Minskiy, Nesvizhskiy, and Dobrushskiy party raykoms. They are typified by an active, purposeful search for new work forms and methods under conditions of expanding democracy, glasnost, criticism, and self-criticism.

Restructuring, acceleration, is a complicated and dialectically contradictory matter. The breaking of the old economic mechanism and the creation of a new one sometimes occurs in a difficult and painful manner. Activity under conditions of complete cost accounting and self-financing is, for many labor collectives, to a certain degree sailing into the unknown, in the course of which one can encounter underwater reefs and all kinds of surprises.

The secretaries, members of the Central Committee buro, and party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms have joined in the work of assimilating the new management system. They are working in the primary party organizations and labor collectives themselves, helping the managers, specialists, and workers to improve the situation. All this helps the cadres, and especially those in areas that have been lagging behind, to overcome the psychological barrier of lack of confidence about one's own efforts and to convince people of the feasibility of the tasks that are currently being resolved.

The party committees, jointly with the soviet and economic agencies, are currently carrying out a detailed analysis to determine whether the managers and specialists at the relatively unprofitable enterprises and farms, as well as those that are operating at a loss, are capable of correcting the situation. The work is being carried out in a differentiated manner, with a consideration of the experience, professional level, and organizing capabilities of the managers. The purpose is to help them to restructure their way of thinking, to master a new kind of economic thought. One also observes here a kind of feedback: the party committees themselves are taking a major political examination dealing with the new methods of managing and administering the complicated economy under conditions of broad democratization and the activation of the human factor.

The republic's scientific institutions are helping the party organizations and the labor collectives to analyze the difficulties and to overcome successfully the obstacles that are arising. For example, the Institute of Economics, BSSR Academy of Sciences, analyzes the financial-production activity and renders practical assistance in implementing the principles of cost accounting and self-financing for ten enterprises. The Belorussian State Institute of the National Economy sponsors five plants and associations. The Belorussian Polytechnical Institute and Gomel University have been assigned to production collectives.

An important sector in the search being carried out by the republic's party organization is the restructuring and democratization of administration. At the republic and

union-republic ministries, the changeover to the two-level system of administration is basically completed. Nineteen administrative links have been eliminated, and there has been a reduction of more than a hundred board (committee) members, including 32 deputy ministers and department managers. This has reduced the cost of running the administrative apparatus at the enterprises and organizations that are subordinate to the BSSR Council of Ministers by 11 million rubles. The merger of the Ministry of Rural Construction and Belmezhkolkhozstroy that was carried out in early 1986 made it possible to reduce the administrative apparatus by 1300 persons, while the volume of operations fulfilled increased by 9 percent.

One still encounters a rather large number of difficulties in the work. One could not, for example, label as a present-day position the position taken by USSR Minavtoprom [Ministry of the Automotive Industry] in organizing the technical servicing and repair of passenger cars. At the present time automotive services are performed in the republic by enterprises and organizations belonging to nine different ministry services. They operate autonomously, without any coordination of the questions involving the efficient placement and use of production capacities. In Minsk Oblast alone, five different associations and centers are in operation — AvtoVAZ-tekhobsluzhivaniye; the oblast and city Avtotekhhobsluzhivaniye associations; and the Moskvich and IZh automotive centers — all of which have their own stations, warehouses, stores, administrative personnel, and procedures. As a result there has been an increase in the expenditures for maintaining the administrative apparatus and the supply and computer-information services, and an increase in the complexity of planning the market funds and the volume of commodity turnover.

The republic's economically substantiated recommendations for the creation of a single system for servicing and repairing motor vehicles have been torpedoed by Minavtoprom.

### Getting the Word to Everyone

An area of first-priority attention for the party committees and organizations is the labor collectives who are operating under conditions of complete cost accounting and self-financing. Starting with this year, enterprises in the automotive, petrochemical, and light industry, as well as a number of large-scale machine-building plants and associations, have been changed over to the new conditions. The share of their output in the overall volume of production in the republic constitutes almost 36 percent. Starting new year, the remaining associations and enterprises in industry will join them.

When actively preparing for work under the new principles, the party committees and organizations and the labor collectives rely upon the experience that has been accumulated by the enterprises in the course of economic experiments. The fact of the matter is that the

cadres at those enterprises analyze the results of economic activity more deeply and carry out a more aggressive search for ways to increase the effectiveness of production.

The party organizations of railroad workers have been carrying out purposeful work to improve the organization of production and labor. Their initiative — achieving a large volume of shipments with a smaller number of personnel — has found broad support among the country's transportation workers. The experience that has been accumulated in this regard is truly rich. Initiatory groups made up of representatives of party, trade-union, and Komsomol organizations, and advanced workers and specialists, have been formed at the administration and sections, and in all the subordinate enterprises. One such initiatory group that has performed actively is the one at the Baranovichi Locomotive Roundhouse, which is headed by Communist O. Shilkin. The collective does not have a single question which has not yet been thoroughly studied or for which a constructive recommendation has not been made. The party organizations and committees daily analyzed the fulfillment of the planned measures. At the party's obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms, the monitoring of the progress of the experiment was headed by the secretaries of those committees.

I would like to emphasize that the work was carried out by the party organizations and by the economic managers not in general, but was conducted with each individual. Here is only one line that describes the level of that work very eloquently: when, as a result of the experiment, there was a reduction of more than 12,000 workers, the various administrative levels received only 26 complaints, and only five of them were deemed to be substantiated.

The overall results of the experiment were that during the two previous years the labor productivity increased by 25.5 percent, but the average wages, by 20 percent. The rise in the wage rates and salaries for the first time in the country was carried out at the expense of the collective's own funds, without any state subsidy.

The accumulated experience enabled the railroad to change over, starting this year, to complete cost accounting and self-financing. Despite the difficulties of last winter, the railroad workers during the half-year overfulfilled the assignment for increase in labor productivity and saved 2.3 million rubles in operational expenditures. That made it possible to extend the fulfillment of a large social program.

The acceleration of socioeconomic development would be impossible without the creation of an effective anti-expenditure mechanism. This is important for all spheres of the economy, but especially for capital construction.

At one time the functioning of the republic's construction conveyor belt did not differ from the work of the construction workers in the other areas of the country. The same long periods of construction, the same shortage of resources, the same settlements on the basis of the work performed, rather than for the finished output. The Central Committee of the Belorussian CP frequently put a lot of thought into the ways of correcting the situation, of getting to a different management level. In the final analysis, it was decided to change over that system of interrelations among the designers, builders, and customers that would assure that everyone in that chain would have a self-interest both in reducing the periods of construction and in reducing the construction costs and improving the quality.

A stable contract price for the construction output — the limit of the estimated cost of the project — was made the basis of the new relations. That price is also the point of departure for making the subsequent economic computations. If the designers or builders have economized, as compared with the contract price, half of that saving goes to them.

Twelve hundred and thirty projects of various types have already been designed under the new conditions, and the economic benefit as a result of improving the design decisions has exceeded 34 million rubles. The expenditure of metal has been reduced by almost 30,000 tons; and cement, by more than 60,000 tons. The labor expenditures have been reduced by 704,000 man-days. The designers have transferred more than 200,000 rubles to the fund for social and cultural measures and housing construction, and the material-incentive funds have been substantially augmented. During the past year alone, approximately 5000 persons have received bonuses for having made contributions to reducing the volume of resources required.

Of course, the conditions in which the designers were placed, in and of themselves, have not yet automatically guaranteed success. This has required a large amount of work by the primary party organizations. For example, the party organization at the Belpromproyekt Institute, which is the republic's leading institute for the designing of industrial projects, defined the priority areas for accelerating scientific-technical progress, activated the collective's better creative efforts, and organized effective monitoring of the implementation of what had been planned. Communists Yu. Sharonov, A. Guryev, S. Kavrey, and others came forth as initiators of the introduction of the brigade form of the organization of labor and the automation of designing. And the result was that almost every third decision at Belpromproyekt is based on a progressive scientific elaboration.

The new economic mechanism has also forced the construction workers to engage in an energetic search for reserves for reducing the labor, material, and financial expenditures. They are encouraged to do this also by the collective contract, which during the current year will be

introduced in all construction subdivisions, thus creating the necessary economic prerequisites for changing over the construction sites to complete cost accounting and self-financing.

In the present five-year plan the volume of construction-and-installation operations in the republic will increase substantially. In particular, it will be necessary to double the amount of housing that is built in rural areas, to increase by a factor of 1.5 the construction of hard-surface motor roads; and to increase by a factor of almost 1.5 the production of building materials. It is planned to asphalt the streets of all the major villages. The ways to achieve what has been planned have been defined. They are, first of, the further activation of people's moral and creative potential, the mobilizing of people to search for new approaches and to locate and use the deep-down reserves.

Tremendous opportunities for improving the activities of the contract organizations lie in the further concentration and specialization of production. At the present time the capacities of the general-construction trust reach, on the average, 25 million rubles of operations fulfilled during the year. We plan to expand the production base of the trusts so that that volume will be doubled by 1995.

### Intensifying the Success Rate of the Restructuring

At a conference of the republic's party and economic aktiv that was held this year, the participants summarized the first results of the work according to the new method, and defined the steps for improving the party support of the restructuring of the economic mechanism and administration, and for involving the soviet, trade-union, and Komsomol agencies more actively in it. It was emphasized that the mechanism of inhibition has not been broken. Among certain workers the opinion has been disseminated that the economic reform pertains only to the economic services. That opinion is not simply erroneous, but is also insidious, since it inhibits the restructuring.

This, for example, is the kind of situation that one has encountered in practical life. Bobruysk Machine-Building Plant director V. Nesterenko and partkom secretary O. Bachura failed to take steps to assure that the changeover to the new management conditions would become a first-priority matter for all the specialists and workers. The preparation was reduced basically to the studying of methodological materials and to the planning and coordination of the quotas. But such questions as the introduction of intraplant cost accounting, the increase in labor productivity, the improvement of the quality of the output, and the intensification of economy measures, were omitted. The natural result was that there was a worsening in the collective's work indicators,

and a reduction in the deductions from profit for payment into the production development fund, the fund for social and cultural measures and housing construction, and the material incentive fund.

And this is another approach. The party organization at the Minskiy Traktorny Zavod Association (partkom secretary N. Stukach, general director I. Kuleshov) began the preparation for changeover to the principles of cost accounting and self-financing long before they received the methodological documents from the ministry. On the initiative of the partkom, a plantwide commission was created, made up of workers, specialists, and representatives of the party and social organizations. That commission defined the basic areas for the practical actions that were stipulated by the party committee.

The first step there was to explain to the collective the goals and conditions of the work under conditions of cost accounting. The collective was informed of the benefits of cost accounting and, very importantly, was convinced that the attainment of those benefits would depend primarily on the workers and employees. For that purpose, the training of the cadres in the economic education network was organized. The partkom members conducted individual talks with the administrative workers of the association, plants, and shops.

Simultaneously, steps were taken to raise the shift-operation coefficient for the highly productive equipment and to remodel the existing production entities. As a result, during the past year alone 426 pieces of that equipment and more than 2000 square meters of production area were freed. All the subdivisions that are part of the association changed over to cost accounting and were assigned stable economic quotas. On the initiative of the party organization, the most important sectors had permanently assigned to them skilled specialists and capable organizers of production, many of whom were elected by the labor collectives. The partkom improved the organizational structure of the party organization and increased the exactingness toward the shop party organizations and the party groups for the results of management.

The implementation of the well thought-out and purposeful measures made literally all the collective members proponents of the restructuring. When the people at the association were discussing the draft of the 1987 plan, the Communists and non-party members proposed accepting the counterplans for the production of tractors and increasing the sale of output, thus making it possible to increase the profit plan by 2 million rubles. The association coped successfully with the assignment for the first nine months. The profit in excess of plan came to approximately 10 million rubles.

The fact that the introduction of complete cost accounting is supposed to become a matter for absolutely everyone does not reduce to any degree the role of the economic services at the enterprises. To put it figuratively, they are the front rank, which sets the tone for the movement.

The composition of the economic cadres was carefully analyzed at the plenum of the Belorussian CP Central Committee that was held early in this year. The unambiguous conclusion was made: the work with them had to be substantially improved. At the present time every third economist and chief or senior accountant in the republic's industry lacks special education. The situation is even worse in construction, trade, and personal services. At the same time, out of 35,000 certified economists employed in industry, almost 4000 are working in jobs that do not require an education.

The work of the ministerial and departmental economic services has also been unsatisfactory. They do not always operate with a consideration of the new situation, and frequently they make stubborn attempts to preserve the customary, conservative approaches to the resolution of the tasks that are posed.

The quotas that have been assigned to the individual enterprises and associations must guarantee the collectives' self-interestedness in improving the work, and must take the production specifics into consideration. In order to define them correctly, it is necessary to carry out a thorough analysis. And that is precisely what the economic services frequently lack. Frequently the quotas are assigned without any visible logic. This is an abnormal situation!

The Central Committee of the Belorussian CP has required the party committees and organizations and the economic managers to improve the use of economic specialists. At the present time the enterprises have developed and are carrying out measures to reinforce the economic services and departments and to raise the proficiency level of their associates.

An increased demand has been placed on BSSR Gosplan, Gossnab, Minfin [Ministry of Finance], and Goskomsen [State Committee on Prices] for guaranteeing the conversion of the branches and enterprises to economic methods of management. Not too long ago, a session of the Central Committee secretariat listened to an oral report presented by the Central Committee's Economic Department concerning its monitoring of the activity of the ministries and departments in improving the economic mechanism and administering the national economy. It was ascertained that the department associates had not yet achieved a fundamental restructuring of the work style and methods of the party organizations and the boards of the economic departments. Those agencies have not been rendering complete assistance to the branch ministries in improving planning, in introducing cost accounting, in setting up exemplary accounting and thorough analysis of economic activity, or in seeking effective economic levers and incentives for increasing the effectiveness of production. The thorough mastery of the strategy and tactics of restructuring, the economic, political, and moral levers of acceleration, and the new management methods constitutes the task that the Belorussian CP Central Committee has assigned

to the ministries and departments. Essentially speaking, we are dealing with the rejection of stereotypes in thinking and in actions, and with the ability to work in an economically efficient manner, with future prospects.

### **Know Your Job and Do Not Be Self-Satisfied With What Was Achieved**

The republic's party organization links the planned, consistent carrying out of fundamental reforms in administration and in the economic mechanism with the introduction of a harmonious system of working with cadres. I would like to dwell briefly on several components of that system.

Recently the promotion of workers has been carried out on democratic principles, in an atmosphere of broad publicity and the complete discussion of the candidacies in the party organizations and labor collectives. It is becoming a rule to elect the managers. When selecting people for the party and soviet agencies, it is absolutely mandatory to take into consideration their work experience in production. At the present time 94 percent of the first secretaries of the party's gorkoms and raykoms, and 98 percent of the chairmen of the city and rayon ispolkoms have this experience. Of them, 64 percent used to be workers and kolkhoz members (in 1980, the figures were respectively 45 and 50 percent). Eighty-five percent of the first secretaries of the party's gorkoms and raykoms, and 87 percent of the chairmen of city and rayon ispolkoms are industrial or agricultural specialists.

It has become a broad practice to require Communist managers to give oral reports at the party meetings of groups and shop and primary organizations, and at plenums of the party committees, to labor collectives. The party's obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms make sure that those reports are given not in a formal way, but instead bear a serious load and prove to be beneficial for those giving the report, as well as a lesson for all those present.

It has become a broad for members of the buro of the BSSR Communist Party to have talks with the managers of oblasts, cities and rayons, and ministries and departments. The obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms hold similar talks with the workers within their competency. The party organizations also make active use of such an effective means of improving the monitoring and increasing the cadres' responsibility as the regular consideration and updating of the performance appraisals of managers whose positions fall within their competency. The performance appraisals are approved at sessions of the Central Committee buro and the party's obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms in the worker's presence.

There has been an improvement in the practice of holding meetings of Communist Party members and plenums of party committees. For example, long before the plenum of the Vitebsk Obkom of the Belorussian CP that discussed the question of the tasks of the party

organizations in restructuring the trade and personal services provided to the public, the residents of the oblast were asked the question in the press: What kind of services sphere would you like to see? Hundreds of replies, recommendations, and desires were received. The method in which the plenum was conducted was also unusual. After a report, its participants became acquainted with the organization of personal services in the oblast center. This helped to discuss the question in a meaningful manner and to plan a constructive program for improving the situation.

These and other forms of work are directed at imbuing in the cadres the need to work creatively and unstintingly, and at assuring that people's capabilities and talents are revealed on the job.

Let's be self-critical and admit that not all the party organizations have successfully assimilated the political methods of managing the development of the economy. I would like to cite a specific instance. Recently the Minsk Production Association for the Production of Broaching and Shearing Machines imeni S. M. Kirov (general director V. Yarmolik, partkom secretary I. Ivanov) was among the advanced enterprises. But now it is, as the expression goes, "limping along." And this has happened because the party organization was self-satisfied with what had been achieved, did not make a self-critical evaluation of the work results, failed to analyze promptly the situation that had developed, and lagged behind the events. It failed to take steps to encourage the managers, specialists, and all the workers to locate reserves for intensifying production. As a result, production fell off. Despite that situation, the partkom does little to penetrate into the activity of the shop party organizations and has not been increasing the demands made on Communist Party members and managers.

That is why the task that has been assigned in the republic has been to restructure the system of training and retraining of party and soviet workers, economic managers and specialists, and the cadres in the mass occupations. The system that is being created is one which has in its center not an "averaged" person, but a specific person with his capabilities and occupational experience, with the questions and needs that are of vital importance to him, with a real attitude toward his duties and to the interests of the collective, and with the ability and desire to work under the new conditions.

The forms that have become the basic ones in the ideological-theoretical and occupational training of the cadres at all levels are the theoretical seminars of managerial cadres at the Central Committee and the party's obkoms, and the city and rayon schools of the party and economic aktiv. In training groups formed according to the branch principle, the students are the managers of republic ministries and departments, oblast services and organizations, enterprises, and kolkhozes and sovkhoses, and workers at party committees and economic agencies. There they study the vitally important questions of the

fundamental restructuring of the administration of the economy, the creation of the mechanism for accelerating the country's socioeconomic development, and the improvement of work style and methods.

Mass forms of economic education have encompassed 1.3 million persons. Engineer-technical workers and middle-level cadres in economic schools and seminars master problems of the intensification of production, the conversion of enterprises to cost accounting and self-financing, the improvement of the quality of output and the raising of labor productivity, and the introduction of progressive technological schemes. Almost 30,000 economic schools and approximately 17,000 schools for the intensification of production and comprehensive schools for improving economic knowledge and occupational skills have been created for manual laborers and kolkhoz members. The combining of various types of instruction of the cadres in mass occupations provides a real opportunity for increasing the success rate of the classes and the practicality of the knowledge.

Here are a few results. The volume of industrial production during the first nine months of this year increased by 6.4 percent, and labor productivity by 6.1 percent, which is higher than the established assignments. Fixed assets with a value 20.7 percent more than during the corresponding period last year have been activated; and 33 percent more housing. There has been an increase in the republic's contribution to the fulfillment of the assignments in the Food Program. The kolkhozes and sovkhoses have grown a record-breaking harvest of grain crops — 35 centners per hectare. There has been a 10-percent increase in the purchases of meat, and a 9-percent increase in the purchases of milk.

What has been achieved is the result of restructuring, of acceleration. But we understand that the obtained results do not correspond to our capabilities. Learning how to manage effectively — that is the task that the republic's party organization is attempting to resolve in an increasingly persistent, increasingly purposeful manner.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatelstvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".  
"Partiynaya zhizn", 1987.

5075

### **Moscow News Describes Latvian Demonstration of November 18**

18120024 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 48,  
6-13 Dec 87 p 4

[Text] On November 18, thousands of people in Riga turned out for a rally. But it was not what had been expected across the Atlantic.

The Daugava waterfront. The ancient towers. The granite shapes of the knights of the Revolution, the Lettish Rifles frozen in their eternal vigil. The blue arrows of searchlights picking out the scarlet posters. The huge square was brimming with people. The voices of speakers rang out...

Gunars Krollis, People's Artist of the Latvian SSR:

"This is my Motherland. I'm standing on my own soil. Along with my own nation I have my roots in it. I sense its anguish, its thoughts and its beauty. Every one of my nerve cells and my heart feel the beating of the pulse of my own land. Its beat determines my work. My words, my work celebrate my love for the country where I was born and where I live. Around me is Latvia. But somewhere across the horizon a thunder is heard. Sometimes the sound of it comes from far away, sometimes from close by. And I do not want anything alien to disturb our life. Not strangers, but the people have the right to choose their own future."

Peteris Grisko, a former member of the Lettish Rifles:

"I shall speak as a soldier. We shall urge our government to take measures against the instigators. In 1917 we deposed the tsar, turned out the Provisional Government. We riflemen had to get far away from our country. The bourgeoisie used the opportunity to seize power in 1918. But we were confident of returning to our Riga, a free, Soviet city. That is what happened."

Ivars Knets, Pro-rector of the Riga Polytechnic Institute:

"The unseemly action by members of US Congress against the people of my Republic is a desperate attempt to wreck our current process of democratization, to torpedo the talks on cuts and elimination of nuclear weapons."

Egils Romanovskis, student of the Latvian University:

"We know how difficult and thorny the Latvian people's road to socialism was. We realize we still have many problems to resolve. On our own. We students can speak about those problems frankly and openly. Not just speak, but try to solve them with other people..."

Ten thousand people of Riga turned up for this protest rally, which as it were put a full stop to the events of November 18, 1987.

Across the Atlantic they expected a different turn of events. Not only expected. They had been planning it. The resolution by US Congress recommended: in connection with November 18, the 69th anniversary of bourgeois Latvia, Western reporters should be sent to Riga to cover the future demonstrations. All US institutions should follow developments in Riga and a presidential representative should be sent to Riga.

The resolution adopted by the rally provided a clear-cut answer to this attempt to meddle in the Republic's affairs.

"We thereby state that we will not have any interference with perestroika, democratization and glasnost or any speculating on and gambling with out problems. We resolutely warn that we are not going to allow anyone to go against socialism, against what we have accomplished over the years of Soviet government in Latvia."

On the evening of November 17 Radio Free Europe congratulated the Letts on their greatest national holiday saying: "There may be bloodshed tomorrow at the Liberty Monument, but this will be a sacrifice for a better future of the nation."

The morning of November 18 saw the arrival in Riga of correspondents of The Washington Post, Le Figaro, Le Monde and British TV. They headed downtown straight away where they were convinced disturbances and protest marches would flare up. They were heading to the square by the Liberty Monument where the "visitors" hoped to witness "clashes with the authorities" and the bloodshed hoped for by Radio Free Europe.

Around eleven in the morning there was quite a crowd around the monument put up in 1935. Its designer Karlis Zale saw it as a symbol of the struggle by the Latvians against the century-long dependence on the German oppressors and tsarism rather than as a hymn to the then bourgeois government. At its foot were red and white carnations. They were placed there by elderly women. A man in a black overcoat standing erect, like a sentry before commanding officers, was trying to simulate mourning. He quit after a minute or two. The people on the pavement smoked and discussed hockey and the weather. It was going to rain. In the adjacent streets life went on as usual. There were more militiamen and members of the public order squad than usual though.

On the eve of November 18 leaflets with nationalist sentiments were found in mailboxes. It was rumoured that several submachine guns had been stolen from the Military Academy arsenal. An anonymous caller informed the militia on the phone that a bomb had been planted near the Liberty Monument and that people should be kept away to prevent victims. All that naturally caused worries. So precautionary measures were necessary.

We spent four hours near the Liberty Monument looking at the British TV crew shooting and listening to what people around were saying. Time ran on, but nothing happened. We called up the Republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs to find out if there were any disturbances in other places. All quiet, no reported arrests.

True enough, people in the crowd had their fill of talking. Among the subjects discussed was June 14, 1941 when several thousand Latvians, mainly members of the

former bourgeois government, officers of the national army, White Guards and policemen were exiled from the country. Unfortunately there were also innocent people among them who happened to be among the number slandered. They also argued about August 23, 1939 when the non-aggression pact was signed between the USSR and Germany. Bourgeois nationalists see in this document the reason for construing the connection between this pact and restoration of Soviet power in the Republic.

A group of youngsters outside the Planetarium Discussed the Helsinki-86 group "manifesto". "To openly, without censorship or pressure from outside, inform international organizations about violations regarding the material and spiritual values of our people and those aimed at the people themselves." So what's the news then? "At present in Latvia conditions of life are absolutely intolerable. The situation is catastrophic." "The number of indigenous population is falling." "An overwhelming majority of modern housing is occupied by outsiders while most Latvians dwell in old ramshackle homes." "Managerial posts are filled by Russians." "Industries non-traditional for Latvia are deliberately being built up." "The environment is dying."

We asked some Latvian officials for their comments on the so-called "slogans".

Prof. Arturs Maurins, head of the Botany Department of Latvia's University:

"Yes, we did have very acute environmental problems. But I don't see what Russians have to do with it? As a matter of fact, some people are trying to bill the flourishing of our folklore as a form of protest against migrants. At this rate you can make any farfetched claims under the sun. As regards failures to protect the environment properly, as an expert I see them as a consequence of the narrow departmental and bureaucratic approach to national interests. Thinking exclusively about their own industry technocrats harm nature and end up damaging national sentiments because everyone has one's own native place, village or hamlet. Here I must blame first of all the local authorities: they are in charge. They have the power to ban any doubtful project. I'm sorry to say that local Soviets were often powerless before the period of glasnost and democratization.

One example is the Daugavpils Hydroelectric Power Station. Two years ago the public urged a revision of the All-Union Ministry. The discussion about whether it was expedient to have a fourth hydroproject on the Daugava was upheld by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia. The project was finally stopped despite the fact that ten million had already been spent on it. Let me repeat, it only became possible now in the period of glasnost in our society.

Here is what we heard in the State Committee of the Latvian SSR for Labour and Social Questions:



"According to the 1897 census there were 1,318,000 Latvians who lived on the territory of the present-day Latvia. The figure was 1,340,000 in 1979. But how many wars happened in between! 640,000 people, mostly Latvians, lost their lives in the Hitler-occupied Latvia. Add to the number of people who died in the wars the 120,000 Latvians who left their country in 1944 (65,000 now live in the USA). Another 6,500 people of various nationalities have left Latvia for other countries in the last decade.

"Now about migration. In 1961-1965 81,000 people came to Latvia: 76,000 came in 1971-1975; 45,000 - in 1976-1980; 53,000 - in 1980-1986. The reason is the lack of manpower needed for the construction of new big consumer goods and chemical factories, and projects in the construction industry essential for the building of housing, hotels and factories.

"One interesting fact is that migration in the first years after the war was negligible. This despite the fact that, if 'russianizing' was the objective, masses of people could be moved into Latvia from the adjacent regions of Russia, Byelorussia and the Ukraine ravaged by the war. In the 1960s and 1970s the inflow of labour was dictated by purely extensive methods of economic development. Ministries and departments could not have seen even in a dreadful dream that the siting of new factories closer to the developed infrastructure could be interpreted some day as a 'passive genocide' against the Latvian people.

"According to forecasts, the migration will peter out soon in a natural way. The neighbouring Republics are already in bad need of personnel. A reverse movement is in evidence.

"One more thing. Migrants, as a rule, are employed in projects involving hard manual effort. They have no practical influence on the other social groups. In the latter part of the 1970s Latvians accounted for 59 per cent of scientists and teachers; while the share of Russians was 29 per cent. The percentages of cultural workers were 66 and 23 percent, artists 67 and 19 per cent, of Party and trade union officials 58 and 32 per cent, of government officials 68 and 23 per cent. So, Latvians hold the sway everywhere.

"Housing is one of the biggest problems. Compared to other Republics Latvia is far ahead on the availability of flats. This is despite the fact that it inherited from the bourgeois Latvia the most decrepit stock of housing. Housing in Latvia used to be over twice as worse than elsewhere in the rest of the Soviet Union.

"The Republic built 31,200,000 square metres of modern housing over 1946-1986. Construction of individual homes in urban areas and the countryside has seen a sharp increase in recent years. Being currently implemented are the two major social programmes Health and Population. They provide for a great number of additional economic benefits to families. The objective is a

population increase. The recent 2 or 3 years have seen a natural population growth. There are now families with two and three children. By way of a reminder, it was in the 1930, the 'heyday' of the bourgeois government, that there was registered a tendency towards an absolute natural decline in the Latvian population. It is a pity that few people know this fact."

In the morning of November 19 we went back to the Liberty Monument. There were only a few carnations strewn here and there as a reminder of the previous day. Frankly, influenced by foreign broadcasts we had expected some developments. Indeed, there had been no dearth of all sorts of predictions and prophesies. But the people had heard them and made their own wise decision.

Alexander Yemelyanov, Yuri Teplyakov, our special correspondents. Riga.

/7310

**LaSSR Buro Judges Action of Western Media  
'Provocative'**

*18080003a Riga CINA in Latvian 13 Nov 87 p 1*

[At the Central Committee of the CP of Latvia]

[Excerpts] At a regular meeting of the buro, in the work of which the first secretaries of town and rayon committees of the party participated, drafts of the republic's economic and social development state plan for 1988 and the Latvian SSR state budget for 1988 were examined.

At the meeting of the buro discussion centered on the provocative action taken by several Western media information and propaganda groups, and a group of U.S. congressmen and senators, who lately, with the aid of various foreign radio stations, endeavored in an intensified manner to provoke hostile actions in our republic. As a pretext for the provocations, they chose the 18th of November, because on that day the forces of counterrevolution imposed upon the people of Latvia their provisional bourgeois government. Here an attempt to distort history is clearly visible, because the Latvian people see the beginning of its state institutions not in the bourgeois republic, but indeed in Soviet Latvia, which was already solemnly proclaimed in December 1917 at the Second Congress of Soviets of Deputies of workers, soldiers and landless peasants taking place in Valmiera.

The buro adjudged the provocative intrigues of Western information media and U.S. congressmen as a coarse interference in our republic's internal affairs, condemned them unanimously and outlined several undertakings for intensified protection of public order.



The buro directed the attention of party committees and organizations, and of all communists to the necessity of increasing political vigilance and of intensifying counter-propaganda and internationalist education, and invited the republic's working people to give an appropriate response to the pretensions of ideological adversaries.

The buro also examined several other questions and adopted corresponding resolutions on them.

/06091

**Riga City Officials Preparing for Demonstration**  
*18080003b Riga CINA in Latvian 18 Nov 87 p 1*

[Article: "Expressing the Will of the People of Riga"]

[Text] As it is known, a group of U.S. congressmen and a small handful of anti-socialist elements are trying to make use of the pseudo-historical day—the 18th of November—for selfish purposes. What is the attitude of the people of Riga toward this action? Such a question was put to the chairman of the city of Riga executive committee, A. Rubiks, by a LATINFORM correspondent.

—The people of Riga have assessed this as a coarse provocation which is directed against the processes of restructuring, openness and our society's further democratization, A. Rubiks said. Let us ask: To whom is this provocation advantageous? The answer will have but one meaning: It is advantageous to Western reactionary circles and, in the first place, to the military/industrial complex, which is frightened by the increase of the Soviet Union's authority in the world arena and the course toward a dispersal of tension, which its angry adversaries must also take into account. On the other hand, it is not at all advantageous to the inhabitants of Latvia, even to those who lost something with the establishment of Soviet power, although the forces which attempt to cause discords here base themselves precisely on these few persons, on adventurers who are not able to comprehend logically the changes taking place in our country, and on immature youngsters who do not have a clear ideological stance and firm positions in life.

The people of Riga, just as the entire Latvian people, are indignant that somebody in the West wants to decide which days they must mark. Moreover, not only a scenario is being composed there but they also demand that a "director," a personal representative of the U.S. President, be received. The "well-wishers" pretend to be fighting for the "rights of Latvians trodden-underfoot." But their action testifies the opposite. The act of disrespect toward the representatives of the Latvian people who wanted to hand in to the U.S. Embassy the announcement of the republic's Supreme Soviet expressing a protest against the resolution of the U.S. Congress has been received in Latvia with indignation. At the embassy they simply refused to receive the deputies of

the organ of supreme power of a sovereign state. This offends the national feelings of Latvians and is an insult to all the inhabitants of the republic.

Correspondent: At the many meetings which took place at the enterprises, organizations, establishments and schools of the republic's capital, the people of Riga expressed a demand to the city's executive committee to organize a protest meeting of the entire city and to do everything in order not to permit nationalistic, anti-socialist anti-Soviet actions. What has the city's executive committee decided to do?

—The city's executive committee has taken notice of the wish of the people of Riga. On the 18th of November from 1600 hours it will be possible for a protest meeting of the city to take place at the Latvian Red Riflemen's Square against the interference of the USA in the internal affairs of Soviet Latvia, and against the ideological subversive activities of the class adversary. Judging by the information received, more than 10,000 people—workers, scientists, creative intelligentsia and school youngsters—will participate in it.

It is natural that in this connection we had to carry out a large organizational effort. At the centre of the city, traffic will be partially stopped, and several tramway, trolley-bus and bus routes will be changed for a short period of time. In order to avoid an excessive concentration of people, the movement of pedestrians will also be restricted at the centre and in Vecriga [the old city of Riga]. By the way, these undertakings for ensuring public order fully correspond with international practice. Under the rules of our city, these are regularly made use of when organizing the demonstrations of the October festival and of the First of May, and also mass cultural and sports undertakings.

Speaking about the possibility of provocative actions, it must be said that we are convinced that reason will gain the upper hand. But the people of Riga themselves will show their proper place to those citizens who would yield to provocation. Together with the militia, order in the city's streets and squares will be maintained by the people's voluntary squad members.

/06091

**Fedoseyev on Soviet, Hungarian Social Science Cooperation**

*18300011a Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 3 Oct 87 p 2*

[Interview with USSR Academy of Sciences Vice President P.N. Fedoseyev by AZERINFORM correspondent N. Barskiy at a meeting of Soviet and Hungarian social scientists in Baku: "Activate the Human Factor: A Talk with Academician P. N. Fedoseyev"; date of interview not given]

[Text] A meeting of Soviet and Hungarian social scientists is taking place with a good working rhythm and in an interested, businesslike, and very friendly atmosphere.

Lively discussions spring up not only during the sessions but also in the lobbies at the Baku meeting and they sometimes continue over tea at the samovar which the hospitable hosts have set up in the entry of the Azerbaijan SSR Academy of Sciences conference hall. And invariably the chairman of the Soviet part of the commission for collaboration, USSR Academy of Sciences Vice President P.N. Fedoseyev, can be found in the middle of the many discussions.

At the request of AZERINFORM's correspondent, the scientist describes the purposes, tasks and progress of joint research projects, their prospects, and ways they can be intensified, and also shares his thoughts on possibilities for restructuring scientific creativity within the framework of collaboration among social scientists.

[Question] From your viewpoint, Petr Nikolayevich, how successfully is the collaboration among the social scientists going?

[Answer] At the present turning point in human history, under conditions of the renewal in social life which is unfolding within the USSR and the other fraternal countries, greatly increasing demands are being placed on the social sciences. This pertains as well to the joint research activity of social scientists from the Soviet Union and Hungary who are playing a clear and growing role in the theoretical consideration and practical solution of key problems in developing socialism in our countries, in the entire socialist commonwealth.

During the 1980's, as in the earlier period, collaboration between Soviet and Hungarian scholars has steadily grown and expanded. A considerable number of joint works have resulted and fruitful bilateral scientific conferences and symposia have been held, which have helped to enrich social scientific thought as well as the consideration from positions of Marxist-Leninist theory and methodology of pressing problems connected with the social and economic development of the USSR and Hungary. Reciprocal travel for the purpose of exchanging experience, the organization of consultations, and the presentation of lectures have taken on a systematic character. Procedures have been developed for the coordination and planning of cooperation.

It is sufficient to mention only a few generalizing indicators. Altogether, during the period from 1951 through the first half of this year, more than 40 scientific conferences and symposia have been held and 28 monographs and collections of articles, as well as a number of scientific reports and methodological works have appeared, generalizing the experience of building socialism in the USSR and Hungary and containing recommendations for the solution of topical problems related to the social and economic development of our countries. The attention of the scientific community has also been caught by such joint works as *"The Great October Revolution and the Hungarian Peoples Republic"*, *"The International Collaboration of the CPSU and the HSWP:*

*Past and Present"*, *"The Socialist Way of Life: Content, Structure, and Dynamics"*, *"The Archeology of Hungary"*, *"Social Problems of Youth and Experience in their Solution"*, and others.

[Question] The effectiveness of changes in the economic, social and intellectual spheres and the consistent development of the democratic beginnings in the life of our society depend to a large degree upon the extent of peoples' conscious creative participation in restructuring. And it apparently is not by accident, is it, that the problem of activating the human factor was placed at the center of discussion at the Baku meeting as a natural and, in the spirit of renewal, obviously critical approach to the results of the work that has been carried out and to plans for the future?

[Answer] Restructuring, in fact, could not but have an effect on our creative collaboration with our Hungarian comrades. The most important thing at the present time is to turn away from general theoretical questions and toward achieving a practical direction in the joint researches of Soviet and Hungarian social scientists, to bring them closer to life. Herein lies the essence of changes in our approach to collaboration. We need to put the accent on those problems, upon the solution of which the intellectual development of the peoples of our two countries to a large degree depends. Research must reflect problems in both the economic and the social spheres as well as the development of glasnost and of democratic principles in the life of socialist society. Therefore, at the present stage of Soviet and Hungarian experience in building socialism, questions of activating the human factor of course became a theme of addresses made by participants in the commission's 7th Session.

If a critical evaluation is made of what has been done in the past, then it will be seen that what is missing from many of our joint projects is a creative approach, a search for non-standard solutions to the problems which confront our two countries and world socialism. Too little attention is being paid to consideration and generalization of the real processes, tendencies and experiences of building socialism in our countries. The activity of the commission is insufficiently related to work on restructuring and intensifying integrational processes, to carrying out the Long-term Program for Developing Economic and Scientific and Technical Collaboration between the USSR and Hungary. The social scientists have been very tardy and extreme timid in associating themselves with work connected with considering and searching for effective ways to solve those problems which are stand in the way of a revolutionary renewal of social life and consciousness, with work on formulating and introducing new organizational forms for scientific and technical collaboration, for socialist economic integration.

Thus, we are not talking here simply about some sort of isolated, piecemeal changes, but about a critical assessment and a fundamental restructuring which will meet

the requirements that are being placed today on the entire mechanism of collaboration in the area of the social sciences.

[Question] Perhaps the meeting in Baku will turn out to be pivotal in this regard?

[Answer] It has to be. We are expecting a great deal from this session; we are hoping for serious results. To a certain extent, work on restructuring the content and procedures of collaboration started back during preparations for the last session of the Commission. In particular, we reviewed and updated the agenda for collaboration and increased the relative share in it of specific projects which are based on timely generalization of the positive experiences of the partners and which have the final goal of preparing scientific reports, memoranda, and methodological recommendations. The scientific and organizational procedures of this collaboration are being improved — a commission of Soviet and Hungarian economists has been established and has started work, and steps are being taken to introduce such progressive work forms as special-purpose, complex, long-term plans.

However, the work of the complex and sectoral commissions of social scientists established for restructuring and increasing the effectiveness of our collaboration is still insufficiently intense and productive. New vigor, as well as considerably more dynamism and purposefulness, must be injected into this work.

[Question] What are the tasks of the scientists in light of the planned activation of direct economic ties between the USSR and Hungary?

[Answer] Today, in an age of a scientific and technical revolution, particular importance attaches to unifying the efforts of the socialist countries, including those of Hungary and the Soviet Union, in mastering the latest achievements of science and technology and in their broad application within the national economy. The Complex Program for the Scientific and Technical Progress of the CEMA Member Countries to the Year 2000 and the Long-Term Program for Development of Economic and Scientific and Technical Collaboration between the USSR and the Hungarian Peoples Republic during this period respond to the solution of these tasks.

The joint projects of our countries' social scientists must contribute in all ways to the further expansion and strengthening of our trade and economic, scientific and technical, and other ties. It is necessary to bring the work of the commissions closer to the requirements of this new era of scientific and technical and economic collaboration between our countries. Economists, jurists and sociologists must participate to a greater extent in work to master and to broadly introduce new forms of collaboration into practice.

One of the promising directions of such work is the recent creation of joint enterprises. As far as I know, this practice has already been developed between Azerbaijan and Hungary. The establishment of direct ties between enterprises is, of course, still only in its early stages. There are many uncertainties and difficulties of an economic, juridical, social and even ideological nature in this regard. The social scientists of our countries, and principally the economists, jurists, and sociologists, must earnestly involve themselves in the study of problems connected with the establishment and functioning of joint enterprises and of other forms related to the practice of intensifying socialist integration; they must help to solve the difficult questions of price formation, reciprocal accounts, legal regulation, etc.

...At one of the Session's meetings of literature specialists it was noted that a four-volume work by the well-known Hungarian philosopher and literary critic, Academician Dyerd Lukacs entitled "*The Special Character of Aesthetics*" ["Spetsifika esteticheskogo"] has been published in Moscow in the Russian Language. This, in the opinion of Academician P. N. Fedoseyev, represented one more favorable opportunity used by Soviet scientists to make a contribution to their creative cooperation with their Hungarian colleagues. Peter Nikolayevich recalled his meetings with this remarkable scholar: "Half a century ago, I worked side by side with comrade Lukacs, sitting in the same office in the Institute of Philosophy in Moscow, when he was writing his famous work "*The Young Hegel*". I recall later meetings with him in Poland in 1948 and in France in 1949, at the birth of the of peace movement, the founders of which included prominent persons active in science and culture, among them Dyerd Lukacs.

13032

#### **Soviet, Hungarian Social Scientists Discuss 1956 Uprising**

18300011b Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian  
4 Oct 87 p 3

[Interview with Ferenc Mucsi, chief of the Social Sciences Department at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, by BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY correspondent G. Mursaliyeva, during a Soviet-Hungarian Social Sciences Commission meeting in Baku: "The Main Thing is the Truth"; date of interview not given]

[Text] In the course of the work of the 7th Session of the Soviet-Hungarian Commission on the Social Sciences, held in Baku, the thought was expressed more than once that the problems of building socialism under contemporary conditions demand a fundamentally new approach. From simply reporting and comparing the experiences of the two fraternal countries, we need to move on to serious analysis; what is required today are conclusions and constructive recommendations. And we can no longer limit

ourselves here to periodic meetings, as was the case earlier. This is the task assigned to the joint working groups which will now operate continuously and systematically.

Our correspondent familiarized herself with a small-scale model of such a group during one of the breaks in the session's work. It developed that two old friends — a Soviet scientist, Doctor of Historical Sciences Tofik Muslimovich Islamov, who is a section chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies, and our guest, Doctor of Historical Sciences Ferenc Mucsi, Chief of the Department of Social Sciences at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, have already been conducting joint scientific investigations for 30 years.

[Correspondent] Economists have participated for only about a year in the work of the Soviet-Hungarian Commission and the psychologists and Eastern Studies specialists also do not have a great deal of experience. As far as I know, the historians were the first, were they not?

[T. Islamov] You can express that even more emphatically: They were the founders. Indeed, you remember, Ferenc, we came up with this idea ourselves.

[F. Mucsi] It was 1968. We were working enthusiastically on the subject of the influence of the February Revolution in Russia on Hungary. Scholars engaged in the study of similar themes in the two countries were cut off from one another and frequently duplicated each other. Coordination was needed. And it was this necessity that conditioned establishment of the Commission. And, following the historians, representatives of other social sciences joined in its work.

[Correspondent] You said that, besides your common work, you are united by personal friendship. Which came first, the joint work? Or did you get involved in this because of your mutual liking for one another?

[T. Islamov] An excellent question. It takes us back to our youth... But I don't know the answer to it. It is difficult to say which began earlier. It sometimes seems to me that Ferenc and I have worked together our entire lives...

[F. Mucsi] But let me be more specific: In 1957, you came to Hungary...

[T. Islamov] And it began! What did I know about Hungary then? I was involved with the subject of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy... I wanted to study the Hungarian language. From the newspapers, I knew of the 1956 events — the counterrevolutionary revolt. But I had a very simplistic explanation for this event.

[Correspondent] This means that you first came to Hungary a year after the revolt?

[T. Islamov] Yes, and I then began to interpret many things differently.

[F. Mucsi] The best explanation at that time, in December 1956, was given by the Provisional Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party. They spoke of the crude mistakes of the former leadership — of Matyas Rakosi. The Rakosi clique followed in the footsteps of Stalin — after 5 years, the Hungarian people lost their faith in justice. It was very simple for the forces on the right to take advantage of the situation.

[Correspondent] You said, Tofik Muslimovich, that you then began to interpret many things differently. If possible, continue your thought.

[T. Islamov] I came to understand that it is necessary to comprehend history in terms of life. To go from life to the facts of history. For example, very many workers took part in the Hungarian revolt. But the newspapers called them the products of a petty bourgeois environment, the birth marks of capitalism, and so on. But the facts were more straight-forward, namely that the people at the time rose in revolt. A people who had lost their faith in an authority which had been seriously compromised by the injustice with which it surrounded itself. This absolutely must be known, so that there will be no return to such times.

[Correspondent] How has this understanding been reflected in your work?

[T. Islamov] Together with Ferenc, I took up the theme of the revolutions in Russia and their influence in Hungary. Here, in particular, we have been interested in a particular aspect — the social composition of the non-majority parties.

[F. Mucsi] There were also mainly workers in the minority parties. But these were not counter-revolutionaries. They had their own ideas of things. And it was necessary to get to the bottom of these. We took the path of clarifying the truth. However, Stalin once made the remark that it is only file drudges who dig around in all this. So, naturally, nobody dug around. Now, when glasnost is illuminating all the things that once seemed to be closed to everyone, including historians, we are able to work with inspiration.

[T. Islamov] They simply said that the minority parties were petty bourgeois. This is easy. It is more complicated to go to the bottom of events, to clarify all their causes and consequences.

[Correspondent] In other words, what you were working on and what you are working on today — these are the blank spots [belyye pyatna] of history?

[F. Mucsi] Blank spots are capable of producing dark deeds. When the truth is not spoken aloud, its place is taken by idle fantasies which quite often carry along with themselves serious social danger.

[T. Islamov] And this is what was particularly stressed at the Commission session: Historians must reveal the truth. There are varied reasons for everything that happens in society. 13032

**Kazakh Trade Union Secretary Interviewed**  
18300033a Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 8 Oct 87 p 2

[Interview with G. T. Chubov, secretary of Kazsovprof [KaSSR Trade Unions Council], under rubric "Reports and Elections to Trade Union Organizations": "Examination for Participation Rate"]

[Text] The republic's trade union organizations which unite as many as 150 members are having meetings to hear reports and hold elections. We say that the reports and elections are a kind of examination. They examine the members of the primary organizations for their rate of social participation and evaluate the role played by the trade union committees in the life of the collectives, in the resolution of the most important tasks of restructuring the economy and people's spiritual life, and evaluate the existing forms and methods of trade union work. How has that examination been proceeding? That is the topic of the interview that our correspondent had with G. T. Chubov, secretary of Kazsovprof.

[Question] The trade unions have a rather large number of concerns that are linked with production and social problems. We call those problems the chief ones, and consider them first of all. But it also happens this way in life: the trade union committee includes all the production successes in the list of its merits, although its merits were completely nonexistent in them or were insignificant. How does one avoid this very persistent type of formalism?

[Answer] Well, at a meeting to hear reports and hold elections, it is necessary to evaluate the work performed by the trade union committee not only the basis of the number of points or "check marks," but on the basis of its content. For example, at the Semipalatinsk Fittings Plant there was a regular process of summing up the competition results, and in this sense everything seemed to be proceeding favorably. But what were they competing for? For plan fulfillment? Because even without a competition it is necessary to fulfill the plan. Brigade leader M. Shaybasov, at a recent meeting, correctly posed the question: it is necessary to compete with a specific goal. It is necessary to evaluate the results from the point of view of the best quality, to compare who has saved the largest amount of resources, who has introduced the achievements of science and technology into practice on a broader scale and more effectively...

Or we have received, for example, a good statement to the effect that the Pavlodar Oblsovprov [Oblast Trade Unions Council] is conducting a competition among the obkoms of the trade unions councils for the accelerated activation of housing. That is something that is beneficial and needed. It is well known that during the second quarter of this year the first place was taken by the obkom of the trade unions council at the agroindustrial complex — agroindustry fulfilled the plan for activation of housing by more than 143 percent! But it is not clear from the statement precisely what was done for that purpose by the trade union committees. Did they create brigades for constructing the housing by the in-house method? Did they recruit volunteers for subbotniks? Did they get building materials? What was their specific participation? If they only observed, as the administrators of the enterprises engage in all of this, then at the meetings to hear reports and hold elections the members of the trade unions council are also supposed to give the corresponding evaluation to the trade union committees. So that, as the expression goes, they can't "horn in" on other people's successes, but, instead, find their own place in this nationwide job.

Unfortunately, we still encounter instances when the trade union committees consider that their participation in the Housing-91 program is simply the distribution of apartments. Here too they do not always execute their functions conscientiously. For example, at the Dzhezkazgan Motor-Transport Production Enterprise an apartment was assigned to the fifth person on the waiting list, but the person who was first on the list was bypassed, in violation of the housing legislation. Currently justice has been restored, the illegal assignment was annulled, administrator P. Reymar and trade union committee chairman G. Mukhina have been given disciplinary punishment — now they are both former administrators. But that happened only after the superior trade union agency interfered.

I am convinced that situations such as this should not be hushed up at the meetings to hear reports and hold elections. The demand made on the trade union committees for the resolution of the production and social tasks must be the strictest and best-principled.

But are we really to believe that the trade union committee does not have to be concerned about the introduction of the collective contract? At a meeting of the primary trade union organization at a Promventilyatsiya sector in the city of Taldy-Kurgan, A. Kokhanov and A. Stankevich gave the following just evaluations in their statements: the contract is being introduced formally. The sector administrators and economic service were sharply criticized for being unable to explain convincingly to the collective the essence of cost accounting.

And what is especially important is that the meeting held the trade union committee strictly accountable. Why hadn't it fought for good organization of the labor? Why had it allowed a large amount of overtime work to be

performed? Why had it taken an indifferent attitude when people were frequently taken off the job for reasons that were not connected with production activity?

The meeting deemed the work of the trade union committee to be unsatisfactory. If one looks at the event by using the old way of thinking — this was an emergency in trade union life. It used to be that this was the only angle from which this was considered. The most unsatisfactory evaluation used to be considered the emergency. But it is not the evaluation, but rather the poor work, that we ought to consider to be the emergency. Then we will be able to be pleased about people's reawakened participation rate. And we would be able to learn serious lessons from such situations. Obviously, the trade union committee that has been newly elected in that sector will have to provide more attention, assistance, and support to the obkom of the trade unions councils.

[Question] At a meeting to hear reports and hold elections, each participant probably thinks to himself: what does the trade unions council mean in my personal life? What has it done for me? How has it influenced my attitude toward the job, my interrelations in the collective... Consequently, the topic in the reports and in the discussions ought to be not only the overall, large-scale successes and failures, but also the individual work with people!

[Answer] Questions like that are inevitable in the agenda. And it is very important for them to be raised at the meetings. The success of restructuring depends on what position each of us takes in it. The republic has had experience in trade union organizations where, on a trial basis, oral reports were given and the performance appraisals of run-of-the-mill members of the trade union members — ordinary workers and kolkhoz members — were approved at meetings of the labor collectives. But unfortunately here, where formalism is completely inadmissible and, apparently, inconceivable, a formal or one-sided approach to the matter is frequently encountered. The claim is made against a person, for example, by evaluating his labor discipline, but the evaluators forget to look at what kind of a person he is in his everyday life, in his family, or how he engages in the education of his children. People will remember the attitude that the person being responsibly discussed takes toward the social jobs assigned to him, but his lagging behind in the fulfillment of production assignments remains in the shadows.

The formal approach to a discussion of people's performance appraisals is still prevalent at the Urals Meat Processing Plant, at the assembly sector of the Ushtobinskiy Machine Repair Plant, at the first sector of the Alma-Ata Post Office, and in the phosphoric acid shop of the Khimprom Production Association in Dzhambul. At the report meetings of the trade union groups there,

those who spoke sharply mentioned that the performance appraisals consist of the same general phrases. It can be hoped that only self-evaluation such as this will break the old useless stereotypes.

Individual work is not limited to discussing people's performance appraisals. It is multifaceted. It includes many things — people's everyday life, mass cultural measures, and the organizing of a healthy way of life. Let us dwell, for example, on just one aspect. The 18th Congress of USSR Trade Unions supported the initiative concerning the conducting in 1987-1988 of the Young People's Dormitory Biennial. Whose field of activity is this primarily? Of course, the trade union organizations'. But what do we see in the practical situation? In many workers and students' dormitories the level of educational work is low and the elementary everyday-living conditions are nonexistent. The dormitories of the Uralskpromstroy Trust and the Alma-Ata Streetcar and Trolleybus Administration are nothing more than a pitiful roof over the head of the people living there. So here, at the meeting to hear reports and hold elections, the young workers can reasonably ask the trade union committee: exactly what have you ever tried to do?

[Question] Essentially speaking, the trade union is the first protector of the workers' on-job rights and interests. But *Kazakhstanskaya pravda* receives a large number of complaints about violations of the law when releasing workers and employees. When we investigate the complaint, we see that some people are fired and are even persecuted because of criticism they have made, but the trade union doesn't even lift a finger to defend their rights. What is more evident here, the manifestation of the legal illiteracy of the elected trade-union workers, or their dependence upon the administrators? Will the current report and election campaign provide this kind of analysis? Can it provide it?

[Answer] One can, of course, mention the lack of sufficient legal knowledge as an objective reason. Because the makeup of the trade union committees is annually renewed considerably, and it takes time for people to accumulate knowledge and experience. But ought one to look for objective justifications wherever justice depends upon the honest and civic boldness of the trade union workers?

I would like to give the following example. At the Aktyubneftegazstroy Trust, construction administration manager A. Shaydetskiy by one stroke of his pen fired 50 people at the same time. The next day their place was taken by 48 new people. Comrade Khaprov, chairman of the trust's trade union committee, knew about this event and took a wait-and-see position. We can only assume that he was unable himself to determine whether or not that action taken by the manager was legal. But he should have at least been alarmed, and had the duty, so to speak,

to start the bells ringing. The presidium of the Aktyubinsk Oblast Trade Unions Council completely correctly removed him from the position that he occupied — for nonfulfillment of protective functions.

[Question] After this example it is natural to ask the question of how collectives currently should choose what people to be their trade union leaders. The content and level of trade union life depend to a tremendous degree upon the person to whom the meetings will give their votes when choosing the new makeup of the trade union committee. But who gives what guarantees to the collectives against making mistakes in the elections?

[Answer] The trade unions have been and continue to be a school of the practical application of the democratic principles contained in the Party Program. At the 18th Congress of the country's trade unions, new Rules for USSR Trade Unions were adopted, and those rules deepen those principles during the period of restructuring.

Let us try once again to analyze certain principles in the new rules. We nominate people to become part of the trade union agencies by discussing freely and completely each one of them. If you know that a person has serious shortcomings, then you should not refrain from mentioning them, because when they later reflect on people's fate, the only thing that you can complain about is your own lack of principles and even your own cowardice.

It is no longer authorized to submit the names of candidates in a list, as used to be the practice. Consequently, various self-interested people will not be able to "pull through" their own man. The number of persons discussed, as a rule, exceeds the numerical makeup of the trade union agencies that has been established by the meeting. That is, you can nominate more people than are needed, and can then choose the very, very best ones.

The rules contain yet another innovation. As was the situation previously, one can conduct elections by secret ballot. But it is also possible, on the basis of the decision made by the majority, to hold an open election. The trade union group organizers and the trade union organizers can also be chosen from among the already elected committee at a meeting by open election. That means that the main trade union leader will be named by the entire collective, which has given him the majority of the votes.

Those are the tremendous opportunities for free election that have been made part of the rules.

Yes, we know that people sometimes backslide into taking an old approach to these questions. For example, at the trade union groups and shops of the Alma-Ata Home-Building Combine, at the AZTM [Alma-Ata Heavy Machinery Plant], the Plant imeni Kirov, and the Ekibastuzugol Association, the meetings to hear reports and hold elections continue to be surrounded by an

excessive emphasis on organization and by "committeitis." Kazsovprom had to correct the attitude shown by certain oblast committees to the reports and elections.

But I am convinced that any of the old habits, any bureaucratism, any excessive emphasis on organization will yield in the face of clearly demonstrated public participation, adherence to principles, and civic boldness.

The campaign to hear reports and hold elections is at its peak. Meetings have already been conducted in half the trade union groups (of which there are more than 160,000 in the republic). Every tenth person among the 31,700 primary organizations, and every fourth person among the 39,000 shop organizations, have reported on their work. And the main thing now is not to lose time, but instead to carry out the remaining major meetings of the year at a high organizational, political, and business-like level.

I would like to remind everyone who is preparing for his meeting of a peculiarity that it has: we are on the threshold of the 70th anniversary of the Great October, and we are defining today our life tomorrow, our successes of tomorrow, and the role of the trade unions in increasing those successes. We are defining them by the participation rate of each person individually.

5075

#### **Moldavian Academician Rebutts Charges on Environmental Issues**

18000042 Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA*  
in Russian No 43, 21 Oct 87 p 10

[Article by A. Zhuchenko, president, Moldavian SSR Academy of Sciences and corresponding member USSR Academy of Sciences: "But Who is Right?": "Making a Victim of Truth"]

[Text] The July 1987 issue of *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* contained articles by writer Iona Drutse, "A Green Leaf, Water, and Punctuation Marks," and by special correspondent Kapitolina Kozhevnikova, "The Cry of the Earth." In these articles, problems of ecology and the restructuring of Moldavian agriculture were raised.

The editors received numerous responses to the articles, primarily from Moldavia. The readers support the position of the paper and are submitting additional information and reflections on the topic.

In place of an official report the editors received three articles which express complete disagreement with the articles published in "LG."

Proceeding from principles of glasnost and democracy, "LG" is today publishing three articles, the authors of which take opposing positions. Unfortunately we cannot reproduce them completely because of their great



length—two of them contained 21 pages. We are presenting them in abbreviated versions, in fine print. The main points have been preserved.

We invite the readers to express their opinions on these materials.

The article by writer I. Drutse, "*A Green Leaf, Water, and Punctuation Marks*," in my view tendentiously depicts the restructuring process in Moldavia; groundlessly negates and discredits the results of socialist construction in the republic; unjustly accuses the participants in the 6th Plenum of the Moldavian CP Central Committee; and finally, commits out-and-out slander against the Moldavian Academy of Sciences and against me personally. Judging from the letters readers are sending to the Academy, the wrongful (although artistically pleasing) interpretation of the author of the article has convinced some and confused others. In publishing the article by writer I. Drutse, "*A Green Leaf, Water, and Punctuation Marks*," and by journalist K. Kozhevnikova, "*The Cry of the Earth*" at the same time, the editors of *Literaturnaya Gazeta* explained in their commentary the unusual nature of such a situation, wherein they desired to present the readers with "two points of view—that of a writer and a journalist—on the same problem: Moldavia in the mirror of perestroika." And although it is hard to understand wherein lies the difference in the points of view of the two authors—who unanimously point to "wrack and ruin wrought under the banners of creation" in the republic (the general thesis belongs to I. Drutse)—the very fact that the editors raised the possibility of various approaches to the problems raised permits one to hope that a genuinely different point of view will be presented as well.

#### **Here the Author Restates Certain Points in I. Drutse's Article.**

I'll touch on questions of the ecological situation in Moldavia, as well as the author's categorical assertion that one cannot count on the objectivity of the republic Academy of Sciences. In this verbose article, where judgments about the ecology and the anomalous economy alternate with "discoveries" in the realm of the reasons for the mental inferiority of the children, it is futile to attempt to find any kind of proof for such accusations.

I. Drutse is responsible for accusing hundreds of scholars at the republic Academy of Sciences of dishonesty in one fell swoop. Common sense alone tells us that such an assertion is absurd. Even if one allows that this is just the normal hyperbole of a writer it is difficult to find an explanation for the groundless assertion which besmirches a great collective. It is also futile to attempt to find proof of the fact that the "administration of the Academy, and above all its president, are indeed the principal strategists of the drying out and the chemical contamination of the soil." It is well-known that the position of any scientist, as well as that of the academy as

a whole, is sufficiently documented in books, articles, programs and practical recommendations. However, I. Drutse does not even contemplate any sort of proof for his accusations. Their falseness is not simply the result of ignorance. After all, one cannot assume that the writer does not know, for example, that thanks to the fraternal assistance of the entire country his "dear little homeland" was changed in the shortest period of time from a backward region into a republic famous not only for its developed agriculture and industry, but also for its ensembles and choir groups, and its outstanding singers, composers, writers and artists. But not even these indisputable facts were able to dissuade I. Drutse from asserting that "national traditions and moral principles were the first to be sacrificed" in the republic, and that the "second blow fell on the Moldavian intelligentsiya..." What then can he say about the academy and the ecology, of which the writer knows only by hearsay. And is it not worth mentioning that every inaccuracy, not to mention one-sidedness and biased criticism, does harm to the cause of perestroika?

But the essence of the question lies not only in the tendentious perceptions of I. Drutse of the past and the present of Soviet Moldavia, and not simply in his withdrawal from the elementary norms of ethics and truthfulness, but in the problems he has raised with respect to the ecological situation in Moldavia, and chiefly—in their interpretation. It is precisely this aspect of the article that forces me to explain my own position on the questions touched on by I. Drutse.

On the strength of my own scientific interests (ecological genetics), my participation in the work of the Commission for the Preservation and Rational Use of Natural Resources of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and finally, by the specific nature of the position which I occupy, I have for a number of years been forced to deal with a wide variety of viewpoints on questions of protecting the environment. I take it upon myself to assert, that people who make superficial judgments about nature preservation deal no less a blow to its real defense as the actions of the pragmatists who believe that the ends justify any means. Dilettantism and destructive pragmatism wittingly or unwittingly find themselves in complete agreement in their attacks on scientists; and the latter are forced to struggle not only with the pollution of the natural environment, but with the information environment as well. When one wants to hide from the real anxieties of life, as Maxim Gorkiy wrote, one resorts to fabrications. But the problems of global and local ecological crises are too serious to make superficial judgments on them, much less wrongful ones.

#### **The Author Reflects Further on Increased Public Consciousness of Ecology and Goes Off on an Historical Tangent of "Society and Nature."**

Perhaps the solution is to reject fertilizer, pesticides and irrigation altogether? There are quite a few adherents of such an approach, although they have no idea how to



compensate in such a situation for the many-fold reduction in crop yields in the face of an increasing population explosion. Such a position is not merely speculative; it has been implemented over the course of the past ten years on so-called "organic" farms in Western Europe. However, according to estimates by leading foreign specialists, organic (or biological) agriculture, which precludes the use of mineral fertilizer and pesticides, is not yet a viable system, and its methods are recommended for poorly-developed countries.

### **The Concepts of "Technogenetic" and "Organic" Farming Are Discussed Further, In Detail.**

And how does all this relate to the discussion with the writer I. Drutse? Unfortunately there is a direct relationship. You see, for ten years now, scientists at the Moldavian Academy of Sciences have been working out a strategy for **adaptive** intensification of agriculture. Its essence lies in the fact that, in considering the soil-climatic, topographic and structural peculiarities of plant production in the republic—steady growth in productivity and savings in resources and energy can be achieved only on the basis of **differentiated** use of each plot of land, selection of the appropriate ecological niche for each crop and even for each variety, and on the differentiated use of technology, fertilizers, pesticides and irrigation. However it is not possible to widely introduce all these recommendations in agricultural production: the trends which have evolved in the country for unification of agricultural equipment and technology and the one-sided increase in the use of water alone in land reclamation have not changed; nor is it possible without changing the system of "titular" planning of agricultural production, without improving the structure of sown fields in every region, taking into consideration the local soil-climate conditions, and so on.

The difficulty in overcoming the indicated trends lies in the fact that the agricultural system which has evolved (which leads in the final analysis to "alienating the peasants from the land" in the broad meaning of the word) is for now not only widespread, but is also accompanied by a powerful organizational-scientific base which is firmly entrenched in hundreds of instructions and recommendations. Proving to the scientists of the Moldavian Academy of Sciences the necessity of a transition to an adaptive strategy of intensification is by no means a simple matter. By his groundless accusations of the Academy, the writer I. Drutse rendered a great service to those who, apparently, will for a long time seek to justify a technocratic approach to intensification of the agro-industrial complex, not reducing but intensifying the pollution and destruction of the natural environment.

Of course the new system for planning the national economy and the transition of enterprises to a self-supporting and self-financing basis, and the introduction of payments for land and water will break up the "bed of

Procrustes" of centralization and scientific-organizational dogmatism; it will create a principally new basis for introducing the principles of economizing on resources and protection of nature to agriculture—that is, an adaptive strategy of intensification. It is hard to overemphasize the role of writers and journalists in the fundamental restructuring of the thinking and social activity of every individual and society as a whole on questions of the preservation and rational use of the environment. I would like to believe that those who take the opportunity to familiarize themselves in greater detail with the strategy of adaptive intensification of agriculture being worked out at the Moldavian Academy of Sciences will act in concord with it.

The ecological situation in Moldavia is truly stressed to the limit. But it seems to me that I. Drutse's desire to explain the situation which has come to pass as the evil, secret design and purposeful actions of "someone" is, to put it mildly, pharasaism on a social plane. The writer cannot but know that Soviet Moldavia fell heir to not only the total illiteracy and shocking poverty of the local populace, but also to natural surroundings fatally injured by the razing of forests, salinization of river floodlands, and gullies rending the earth over an area of tens of thousands of hectares. And that is why over the entire postwar period not only has the economy of the republic grown year after year, but nature's wounds have been healed as well. During the period 1961-1983 alone, Moldavia's forest lands increased by 127,000 hectares and over 35,000 gullies were eliminated; moreover, nearly 10,000 of them—an area of 6,798 hectares—were turned into arable land; thanks to land reclamation the salinated river floodplains have begun to produce crops.

The principal natural wealth of Moldavia lies in its fertile land and a favorable climate for growing fruit, vegetables and grapes—the products of which are justifiably called the "health of the nation."

### **Figures Cited on Expanding Production of Fruits and Vegetables**

Is it really true, as I. Drutse asserts, that the nurturing lands in the republic have become "hostages in the hands of totally irresponsible people," and that the economy itself has become abnormal? It is well-known that in terms of its productivity, Moldavian chernozem is greater than even that of the Kuban. Moreover, in the overall structure of the country's arable lands under cultivation, such highly-productive soil amounts to only 3.0 percent, and of these only about one-third falls to the lot of Moldavia! Yes, it's really true, that during the postwar period the yield of basic crops in the republic has grown significantly, thanks to mechanization and the adoption of chemical methods. However, in comparison with, for example, Hungary, Bulgaria and Czechoslovakia, where the average level of fertile soils is incomparably worse, the yield of grains, vegetables and fruit crops is still significantly greater.

But in these respective countries for every hectare of cultivated land, 288, 259 and 338 kg of mineral fertilizer are applied; whereas for Moldavia the figure is only 182 kg per hectare. Is it worth mentioning the FRG, Belgium and the Netherlands, where the average dose of fertilizer reaches 400-700 and more kg per hectare of arable land?!

The author's article eloquently describes the misfortune of Moldavia connected with the shortage of water, and with the systematic creation of desert areas due to the drought. And this is all true. "Here it is not the earth which brings life, but the heavens," as they used to say in Bessarabia in the last century. Well? And then what? You see, "after speaking about the earth and about water," and even about a "feeling of measures," something must be done. Neither yesterday, nor much less today or tomorrow will there be successful socio-economic development in Moldavia without a change in its water supply; it's simply impossible. And will a light-hearted play on words such as "Kishinev rules," or "fate has made the Dnestr, one of the most polluted, a doomed river..." [obrechennaya reka] really help correct the mistakes which have been made, moreover provide a constructive solution to the waterless republic's problem? "They began to use a special procedure for construction of the Dubossarskaya GES," writes the author with irony. Yes, they set about and built it in 1954. And then what? Instead of kerosene lamps electric lights appeared in the homes of the people. You see in that period the low-powered thermal electric power stations existed only in the major cities of Moldavia. The construction paid for itself in only five years after its completion, and today over 20,000 hectares are irrigated thanks to the Dubossarskiy Reservoir, and seasonal regulation of the flow of the Dnestr is partially provided. Kishinev began to be supplied with waters from the Dnestr only in the 1960's, and the Dubossarskaya GES had no effect on that whatever.

Presently in Moldavia barely 300,000 hectares of arable lands are irrigated; these lands, which comprise 13 percent of the arable land, provide more than 25 percent of all horticultural products in terms of value. Moreover, 98 percent of the lands are irrigated with the help of sprinkler systems which, although the most costly, are also the least likely to cause erosion. However, further possibilities for developing irrigation agriculture, especially in the southern and driest zone of Moldavia, at the expense of water resources available from the Dnestr and the Prut, are practically exhausted today. And therefore it is altogether logical that, along with the tasks for making the most economical use of every cubic meter of water, determining the optimal size of the land area undergoing reclamation and perfecting the technology and equipment for irrigation in the republic with the least water, the problem of increasing water resources is also being solved by means of regulating and adjusting the run-off from the Spring thaw in not only the larger but also the small rivers. Then why in this situation does I. Drutse make such pedantic, sarcastic remarks about his own countrymen: "They have regulated the flow of

the small rivers and have spoiled them, while the great storage areas are evaporating and turning into swamps." I must state that regulating the flow of the rivers at their flood stage has been going on in the Dnestr-Prut inter-fluvial area for hundreds of years and has been commonplace for the local populace in their struggle "for water" and "with water."

Yes, truly, quite a few mistakes were made in the past, in Moldavia as well. From the position of hindsight today we can see them much better. But instead of reveling in the mistakes of the past we should correct them; moreover, we have no insurance policy against mistakes, neither in the present nor in the future. And in the real, and vitally necessary and constructive work of correcting mistakes, no one has the right to hide behind the palings of subjective skepticism and sarcasm.

Up to now a great many kind words had been spoken of the cultural level of discussion under conditions of democratization and glasnost, and about a respectful attitude toward the opinions of one's opponents; therefore it is difficult to understand I. Drutse, who has adopted an accusatory, prosecutorial tone which permits no objections whatever, on everything that has been done in Moldavia. You see, in actual fact, in his entire article, aside from the "malicious pleasure of negation," it is hard to find even a hint of constructiveness, of an interest in healing the social and economic ailments, or a desire to make some kind of suggestion or somehow to help.

#### **The Author Turns to the Example of the "Lenin Memorial Garden" Which in His Opinion is One of the Best in the Republic.**

It is probably not necessary to point out that under conditions of glasnost it is unacceptable to present the reader with a "subjective concoction" in the place of objective analysis. Having seized on a portion of the truth with fervor I. Drutse uses calculated half-truths in his article to create a model of a republic and a nation on the decline, to convince the reader of the fact that "for some time now a certain kind of misfortune has begun to hover..." over Moldavia. Such polemical embroidery, false conclusions, distortion of the facts and tendentiousness are hardly capable of helping matters.

I believe that the aforementioned has a direct relationship to I. Drutse's remarks with respect to the 6th Plenum of the Moldavian CP Central Committee, which discussed the tasks of the republic party organization on carrying out the resolutions of the June 1987 CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Even if one peruses only the annotated speeches of the plenum participants which were published in the press, one has to be wildly biased to assert that "All the speeches were delivered in a cheerful vein, and all were filled with uplifting optimism, as in anticipation of a coming holiday..."

What did the members of the Moldavian CP Central Committee and other plenum participants do to deserve such a lordly, skeptical attitude on the part of the writer? More than likely, it was due to their subjecting to criticism a certain group (fortunately, a very small one) of the Moldavian Society of Writers. For what? Permit me to briefly cite the essence of his article. Specifically, it spoke of the fact that, "one cannot remain silent" in the face of certain publications and speeches which, under the pretext of criticism of a draft long-term ecological program, not only propagandize in a biased manner an anti-scientific, vulgar understanding of the use of the natural environment (of the type: Down with chemicals and land reclamation, and so on)—but also take the position of a local ultra-patriot of placing the economy and the ecology in opposition to one another. Thus, in violation of the elementary norms of ethics, leading scientists, specialists and scientific centers are groundlessly discredited. The attempt by the aforementioned "critics" to accuse part of the scientists of insufficient loyalty to their locality, and another of "indifference to the fate of Moldavia," draws special attention to itself. The article also speaks of attempts by certain literary figures to utilize the mass information media for "expressing their personal and group ambitions; for falsifying the historical processes and not evaluating them on a class basis; and for groundlessly denying the achievements of Soviet Moldavia."

I. Drutse writes that the president of the republic Academy of Sciences "has hardly any conception of what is upsetting the people (in the Writers' Society)." Is that so? The author of the article cannot but know that in addition to scholars in the natural sciences, institutes of language and literature, history, economics, ethnography and art criticism, philosophy and law, are also represented at the Moldavian Academy of Sciences, where hundreds of skilled scientific associates are at work. And at the Central Committee Plenum I was expressing not only my own personal opinion, but also those of the leading scholars at the Academy. You see, patience and respect for other points of view are not the equivalent of the loss of one's own position in the defense of historic truth against social demagoguery and ambition—even that of the so-called "victims of the period of stagnation."

The subjective and sensationalist enthusiasm of certain authors, which makes a victim of truth and constructiveness in the discussion of the urgent problems of perestroika, does not contribute to their solution. One can neither accept it nor justify it.

09006

#### **More Efficient Mining Urged in Tajikistan**

18340409a Dushanbe KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, Jul 87 pp 58-63

[Article by Kh. Muhabbatov and Sh. Ghafforov]

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, July 1987 carries on pages 58-63, under the rubric "Social and Economic Problems

of Perfecting Socialism," a 1900-word article, "Let Us Use Mineral Resources Wisely," by Kh. Muhabbatov and Sh. Ghafforov, both candidates in economics. The authors state that in all the countries on "our continent" the quality of raw materials has declined in recent years; mines have been deeper and located in remote places, far from industrial centers. Using these materials has been costly; in recent years the cost of extracting one tone of material from mines has increased by a factor of 2 to 2 and 1/2.

Some scientists think that this cost makes mining in the eastern part of the Soviet Union worthwhile. However the resources of the eastern regions are consumed there. Therefore regional production complexes should be developed. Thus it is feasible to develop large mines in areas of Tajikistan such as Shimal, Zeravshan, and Gorno-Badakhshan. The future development of agriculture, machine construction, and chemistry depends to an important degree on the development of extractive industries. The 20th Congress of the Tajikistan CP anticipated that during the 12th 5-Year Plan the republic's production of nonferrous metals must increase 35-40 percent. This counted on the expanded and restructured use of existing means. Along with the development of nonferrous metallurgy new fuel factories and construction industry plants will be built. This requires the wise use of mineral resources.

In Tajikistan the wise use of mineral resources is especially important because the republic is rich in mineral, hydro-electric, and labor resources but has limited agricultural land and an imbalance between the location of labor and production.

Despite the introduction of advanced technology to Tajikistan's extractive industries in recent years minerals are still lost in extraction and processing. This makes it expensive to run existing mines and establish new ones. Because the mineral extraction plan was not fulfilled ore purification plants operate at only 60-70 percent of capacity, which is harmful to those plants.

The authors advocate using methods of extracting and processing minerals that protect the environment and recover the various useful minerals and chemicals associated with the ores. This has economic as well as environmental benefits.

Tajikistan's ore purification technology is old. Ore processing annually produces millions of tons of waste by-products which pollute the soil, water, and air. However these by-products contain valuable materials which ought to be used in construction. This would produce a 20-30 percent price saving over obtaining such materials by conventional methods. Now more than 95 percent of the ore ends up as waste by-products.

/9738

**Development of Tajikistan's Mountainous Areas Analyzed**

18340409b Dushanbe KOMMUNISTI TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, Jul 87 pp 64-68

[Article by U. Kletselman]

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TOJIKISTON in Tajik No 7, July 1987 carries on pages 64-68 a 1300-word article, "Putting Mountainous Regions of the Republic to Use," by U. Kletselman, a candidate in economics. Tajikistan's development requires making use of its mountainous regions. The valleys are already used extensively. Measures must be devised and implemented to expand economic relations between the mountains and valleys and to eliminate the difference in the way of life of the mountainous regions' inhabitants. Social production, except for mining and related industries, developed primarily in Tajikistan's valleys.

Tajikistan has a lower average population density than other mountainous republics because half of Tajikistan's territory is at an altitude of 3,000 meters above sea level and 60 percent of it is composed of rocks, snow, glaciers, and the like. This makes it unsuitable for agriculture or animal husbandry. Thus Tajikistan's territorial resources are limited. In Gorno-Badakhshan, Zeravshan, and Garm 90 percent of the territory is unusable for agriculture. Therefore Tajikistan has an extremely uneven population distribution. In mountainous areas the population density is 1/14th the average for the republic as a whole (which ranges from 50-500 people per square kilometer.) In Tajikistan, with its limited amount of land and highest rate of population growth in the Soviet Union, the ratio of farmland to village population is the lowest of all the mountainous republics. In Kirghizia it is 0.58 hectares per villager; in both Azerbaijan and Armenia, 0.46; in Uzbekistan 0.40; in Georgia, 0.33; in Tajikistan 0.17.

In the past decade tobacco cultivation has increased in the Zeravshan Valley and the eastern Pamirs. This has helped the economic development of mountainous areas, where, at an altitude of 2,000 meters, about 12,000 tons of tobacco has been grown. It takes 20 times more labor to grow a quintal of tobacco than to grow the same amount of cotton. Yet this is feasible in mountain areas because of the availability of people to do manual labor and the small amount of farm land. This makes high-profit activities worthwhile. Much more mountain land can be brought under cultivation through the introduction of new activities, like the intensive cultivation of various grasses and the establishment of gardens.

Mountainous areas can be used to expand irrigation greatly in Tajikistan. It would cost little to build the means to store water from the rainy season at mountain lakes and then use the water for irrigation. This would also reduce soil erosion and flooding. There are areas of the mountains and foothills that can be irrigated only by

pumping water to the surface. Bringing these lands into production through the establishment of gardens and vineyards is an important part of Tajikistan's agroindustry.

The mountains' unreliable energy supply slows those areas' economic and social development. The solution is internal: establishing mines for fuel, such as coal; electrifying the inefficient, decentralized consumer heating system; using predominantly non-traditional sources of heat (solar and geothermal sources and the wind).

The use of hydroelectricity in the mountains is important because of the cost of transporting fuel to such places. The construction of hydroelectric stations and reservoirs in the mountains strengthens economic relations between the valleys and mountains. The construction of small hydroelectric plants (0.5-2 kilowatts) in the mountains is as important as the construction of large ones. The small plants will be able to meet the limited needs of remote areas, which cannot be incorporated into the unified power grid in the next 10-15 years.

The development of mineral resources in the mountains will require much money and time before their profitability can be judged. This is because of the cost not only of the mines themselves but also of the substantial infrastructure requirements, like railroads, automobile roads, gas and oil pipelines, water lines, and tunnels. For example, coal from large mines in the mountains costs more than coal mined elsewhere because of the cost of building mine railroads. The climatic extremes in the mountains are also a problem. Planners must make intensive capital investments in mountainous areas. In light of all this factories in the mountains must be relieved of some of the cost of infrastructure construction.

A crucial and expensive need is to improve and expand transportation within mountainous areas and between the mountains and valleys. This includes ensuring that routes linking the mountains to the valleys are open year round. A major problem is the "complete reconstruction" of the automobile road between Dushanbe and Leninabad. This will greatly affect not only relations between the uplands and lowlands but also between northern and southern Tajikistan. Currently Leninabad Oblast and the industrial complex in southern Tajikistan are isolated from each other. This is an obstacle to the economic development of Tajikistan as a unified entity. The railroad between the two areas follows a route about 1340 kilometers long; the automobile route is under 300 kilometers long. Rebuilding the Dushanbe-Leninabad road has been under consideration for 15 years.

/9738

**Water Pollution in Tajikistan**

18340409c Dushanbe ADABIYOT VA SAN'AT in Tajik 16 Jul 87 pp 14-15

[Article by Nasrullo Asadulloev]

[Editorial Report] Dushanbe ADABIYOT VA SAN'AT in Tajik on 16 July 1987 carries on pages 14-15 a

1300-word article, "Alas for the Varzob Valley, Alas for the Sweet-Watered River" by Nasrullo Asadulloyev, a special reporter for ADABIYOT VA SAN'AT. The article is subtitled, "The Varzob Valley Is Ruined and the River Polluted But No One Is Worried About It!" Although 30 miles from Dushanbe the Varzob's water is clean, in the heart of the city it has 2 times less oxygen and 10 times more bacteria of all kinds. Polluted water flows to the work place and home "and no one is safe from it." Asadulloyev further states that, "In truth the river's water is extremely polluted and no one is worried about cleaning it up." The situation worsens from year to year despite numerous articles, plans, and directives about cleaning the Varzob. PRAVDA first sounded the alarm a decade ago.

In 1978 the Varzob Valley was incorporated into the city of Dushanbe. The establishment of recreational facilities in the valley increased since 1979. Of the dozen villages, nearly 30 food facilities, and numerous recreational facilities there only 2 have water purification systems and those do not always function properly. The pollution from these sources flows into the Varzob. Another source of pollution is from vehicles used to move livestock between summer and winter pastures. Factories in Dushanbe, major polluters, have built plants at the entrance to the Varzob Valley, increasing pollution in the valley.

In 1986 Tajikistan's Ministry of Health Care resolved that no more facilities be built which could pollute the Varzob. However this has had no practical effect; the Ministry has permitted the establishment of additional pollution-producing facilities. In 1986 the sanitary and epidemiological station of Oktiabr'skiy Rayon closed all the food facilities of the consumer association in Varzob for polluting the water and air without authorization. However the rayon ispolkom "and other higher administrative bodies" soon gave permission for these facilities to operate. The sanitary and epidemiological station reported a sharp increase in infectious diseases in the Varzob area because of environmental pollution.

The number of recreational facilities in the valley and the number of people who use them will rise through 1990. The Varzob Recreational Place Administration, which lacks the money, people, and technology to deal with the pollution problem, and the Dushanbe ispolkom cannot solve the problems by themselves. The valley needs the help of republic-level agencies.

/9378

### **Sumgait Population Growth Outpaces Housing**

18310414 [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 13 September 1987 carries on page 3 a 2100-word article by Ruslan Rafizade under the rubric "Problems and Observations" on the fact that the population growth in Sumgait has been outpacing residential housing construction over the last several years. "When the last master plan for the city was drawn up some 15 years ago, a number of mistakes were permitted. The discrepancy between planned and actual population growth in the city was close to 80,000. This led to the construction of residential housing, schools, kindergartens, hospitals and cultural, trade and service buildings without taking this 80,000 into consideration." Reasons behind the faulty planning include frequent management changes and the fact that construction equipment has not arrived on time. Among the consequences are that "the labor force is not coming here; on the contrary, members of the collective are leaving and going elsewhere."

/12232

### **Bureaucratic Overlaps Impede Nature Preservation**

18310420 [Editorial Report] Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri on 17 September 1987 carries on page 3 a 2000-word article by B. Adygozalov, chairman of the AzSSR State Committee for the Preservation of Nature, on the need to resolve issues of overlapping bureaucratic authorities in order to improve the preservation of nature; the article is headlined "The Numbers Are Great, but Usefulness Is Slight." He points out that "often, the control organs themselves spoil the resources they are protecting. For example, the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources, the Administration for the Control of Caspian Basin Waters, the Geological Administration, the Southern Caspian Basin Fisheries Administration, the Hydrometeorology Committee, and the Ministry of Health are engaged in the preservation of water in Azerbaijan. The Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources and the Administration for the Control of Caspian Basin Waters have 'divided' Azerbaijan's territory between themselves, but are unable to define their 'boundaries.'" Because of this confusion, "no effective measures are being taken."

/12232

END

10

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated. Those from English-language sources are transcribed, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [ ] are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names which are rendered phonetically or transliterated by FBIS/JPRS are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source.

## SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in 8 volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Africa (Sub-Sahara), Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically. Current JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcovers or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. DOD consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate

command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.) For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (703) 527-2368, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.